1973

Research as a Function of Selected College-Controlled Laboratory Schools.

Robert Ethiel Hearn
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

RESEARCH AS A FUNCTION OF SELECTED COLLEGE-CONTROLLED LABORATORY SCHOOLS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

in

The Department of Education

by
Robert E. Hearn
B.S. Centenary College, 1960
M.A. Northwestern State University, 1966
August, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Ollie B. Fuglaar, Chairman of his doctoral committee, for the counsel, encouragement and direction so generously given on many occasions.

Special thanks are extended to the other members of the writer's committee, Dr. Alvin Bertrand, Dr. Doris Conway, Dr. William Eglin, Dr. G. C. Gibson, and Dr. Joe Parker for their suggestions, encouragement and editing of the manuscript.

The cooperation of the many administrators and officials, who contributed information for the study, was outstanding. Sincere appreciation is gratefully acknowledged for the time and efforts of these educators.

Appreciation is expressed to Mrs. David Fowler who prepared the original manuscript, and to Mrs. John Judice and Mrs. J. E. Sedberry for the preparation and editing of the final manuscript.

The writer wishes to express his sincere gratitude to his wife Margie for her understanding and assistance during years of course-work, study and writing. Special thanks to the writer's daughter, Sharon, and son, Robert, Jr. for their understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain current commitment to research as a function of laboratory schools in terms of stated objectives, research in progress or completed during the last five years, and arrangements and conditions provided to facilitate that commitment in selected college-controlled laboratory schools. The gathering of these data served as a basis on which to identify policies and practices conducive to research productivity.

Two hundred eighty-four institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education were surveyed by questionnaire to identify the institutions with college-controlled laboratory schools which had been engaged in research activity within the past five years. From a total of sixty-seven institutions reporting research on the initial questionnaire, twenty-three were selected to participate in a more detailed study of research in their schools.

These institutions were sent schedules for reporting research, a taped response schedule, and a blank cassette tape to be utilized in responding to the questions on the taped response schedule.

The initial survey questionnaires, schedules for reporting research, and taped responses were analyzed. Data revealed that several new laboratory schools have been established, whose major aims were to focus upon becoming productive research centers. Many of these had publications devoted to the orderly dissemination of research findings.

Several important changes were noted in the functions of laboratory schools. Student teaching was reported as either removed from the responsibility of the laboratory school or reduced to a minor function. Pre-teaching experiences, observation, and demonstration remained as major functions of most laboratory schools. An increased emphasis on research was noted as an apparent trend with this function ranking first, second, or third in most institutions.

Although considerable interest and productivity in research were reported, some factors have hindered research. Factors mentioned most frequently had to do with physical and monetary resources. Most institutions indicated a need for additional qualified research personnel and for additional physical facilities to be utilized in research.

Data indicated that college-controlled laboratory schools can serve as unique centers for experimentation and research. Much research has been conducted by college-controlled laboratory schools; and administrators of the selected schools

regarded college-controlled laboratory schools as uniquely capable of research not possible in public schools.

Results of this study seem to have indicated that the following recommendations are in order:

(1) A staff including a research director and clerical assistance should be provided.

(2) Provision should be made for adequate financial support of research.

(3) A competent faculty interested in research productivity should be selected.

(4) Adequate funding and staff for the dissemination of research findings should be available.

(5) Control over the nature and size of the student population would be warranted.

(6) Multiple sections of each grade within the laboratory school for research studies would appear necessary.

(7) Administrators, deans and department heads, and other officials, should give serious attention to the matter of improving morale and rapport through concerted efforts to effect better communication and coordination between laboratory school faculties and colleges of education.

(8) Researchers from various disciplines within teacher education programs should identify ways of working

together toward goals of mutual concern to laboratory school personnel and researchers.

(9) Research should be promulgated through media of communication such as tapes, films, lectures, seminars, articles, dissertations, and published bulletins.

(10) The National Association of Laboratory Schools should continue encouraging research in college-controlled laboratory schools and assist in the dissemination of resulting data to its membership and to other interested parties.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Laboratory schools have been traced to their origin in Europe during the seventeenth century. The development of laboratory schools was due largely to an awareness of the need for observation, student teaching, and laboratory experiences as components designed for the preparation of teachers.

The early normal school movement provided much of the history of laboratory schools and their development as we know them today (Kelley, 1967).

From its early beginning in the normal schools of the United States, the laboratory school has held a favored position in teacher education programs.

Henry Barnard (1839), an early influential leader in American education, recommended that teacher training institutions operate model schools which could be used to put theory into practice and serve as examples for district schools.

The first state normal school in New York opened in Albany in 1844 and added a training school in 1846 (Williams, 1942). David P. Page, principal of this training school, is

credited by Hughes (1959) as the first educator in the United States to express a distinct concept of the function of the training school in the preparation of teachers. He recognized the need for student teaching experiences under actual classroom conditions for a sufficient period of time to properly prepare students in the fundamentals of teaching.

The growth and development of laboratory schools continued through the years with role modification being accomplished as was warranted.

Blackmon (1962) indicated the laboratory school personnel assumed generally that the major functions of such schools were observation, practice teaching, and research.

A study by Kelley (1964) suggested that the most important roles identified by laboratory school personnel were observation, demonstration, and student teaching. Research, participation, experimentation, and in-service education were not accepted as of major importance.

Howd and Browne (1970) concluded that, in general, the percentage of schools in their study that considered observation and demonstration to be of major importance was about the same as the percentage which indicated the importance of these functions in the Kelley study. They cited two significant changes in role identification since the Kelley study of 1964. A major change in role identification was

noted as emerging to encompass research, experimentation, and in-service education. A marked decline in the role of student teaching was observed; slightly more than half of the schools responding indicated that they either made limited contributions or were not used at all for student teaching.

Van Til (1970) speaking to laboratory school administrators, cited two significant trends of importance to laboratory schools. At an increasing pace the public schools were being used for student teaching. Increasingly, many innovations in education were coming from projects financed by the federal government or by foundations.

Goodlad (1971) warned that if laboratory schools were to continue they must provide exemplary models of high level research activity dealing with teacher-learner theories.

The impact of these and other trends, i.e., the closing of many laboratory schools in recent years, coupled with warnings from several sources have caused laboratory schools across the nation to re-examine their roles in an attempt to define a role which they are uniquely suited to perform.

Howd and Browne (1970) identified major roles or functions such as observation, demonstration, experimentation, and research as those accepted by laboratory schools.

There was an apparent trend toward changing the name of some laboratory schools to reflect a change in emphasis

toward experimentation and research functions. Howd and Browne (1970) reported that almost 28 percent of the schools reporting stated that they had changed their name to indicate this new emphasis. Some laboratory schools were being called "Center for Curriculum Study," or "Center for Experimentation and Research in Learner-Teacher Activities."

Howd and Browne (1970) reported that forty laboratory schools had closed between 1964 and 1969 while five more were scheduled to close. Eleven new schools opened or were scheduled to open between 1964 and 1971. The principal reason given for opening a new school was the need for a facility in which research and experimentation could be conducted.

The present study was concerned with research and experimentation as a function of selected college-controlled laboratory schools. It was recognized that this was not necessarily a function of all laboratory schools, but because of the importance of research in a teacher education program, it was a function of many laboratory schools.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to ascertain current commitment to research as a function of laboratory schools in terms of stated objectives, research in progress or completed during the last five years, and arrangements and

conditions provided to facilitate that commitment in selected college-controlled laboratory schools. The gathering of these data served as a basis on which to identify policies and practicies conducive to research productivity.

The following basic assumptions were made:

(1) Research was identified as a major function of some college-controlled laboratory schools.

(2) Quality research was a product of some of the college-controlled laboratory schools identifying research as a major function.

(3) Laboratory schools which are active and productive in research efforts followed certain policies or practices which seem conducive to the success of the research.

THE PROBLEM

The primary problem of the study was to identify policies, arrangements, or conditions which seemed to facilitate productive research in college-controlled laboratory schools that accepted research as a major function. A related problem was the identification of practices or conditions that hindered research activity. Another related problem was the analysis and synthesis of data gathered from participating college-controlled laboratory schools into a model or composite picture of a laboratory school productive in research.

DELIMITATIONS

The study was limited to college-controlled laboratory schools operated by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education accredited institutions offering advanced degrees in at least one of the areas indicated in the NCATE Annual List 1971-72.

DEFINITIONS

College-Controlled Laboratory School. For the purposes of the study, a college-controlled laboratory school was defined as an educational institution operated under the administration and control of an NCATE accredited college or university. This definition was intended to include any laboratory school meeting the definitions although they may be called "campus school," "demonstration school," "experimental center," or other names. Such schools included all and only partial groupings of the educational levels from pre-school training through the senior year in high school.

The terms college-controlled laboratory schools and laboratory schools were used interchangeably in the study.

Research. For the purposes of the study, this term applied to published or nonpublished reports or descriptions of experimentations related to educational practices or principles. Although some authorities make a distinction

between research and experimentation, for this study no such distinction was made. Therefore, research as used herein may vary from complex cooperative programs involving many persons or even other facilities of public schools, to action research or experimentation on the part of an individual teacher or faculty member of the parent college or university.

Abbreviations. The abbreviation NCATE was used throughout the study to refer to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

GENERAL PROCEDURES

Upon completion of the review of pertinent available literature, an initial survey questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire was used to survey NCATE accredited institutions for the purpose of identifying college-controlled laboratory schools from institutions that had conducted research during the last five years.

Initial Survey Questionnaire. The Initial Survey Questionnaire was sent to 284 institutions, appearing on the NCATE Eighteenth List 1971-72, which offered advanced degrees in at least one of the categories of programs identified by NCATE.

The returns from the Initial Survey Questionnaire were evaluated on the following arbitrary basis: one point

was assigned for each unpublished study reported; two points were assigned for studies in progress; three points were assigned for published studies; and four points were assigned for studies which involved specific grants.

From the tabulations and criteria established, a Research Involvement Scale was determined for institutions reporting research.

From the analysis of the returns of the Initial Survey Questionnaire, it was revealed that sixty-seven college-controlled laboratory schools from NCATE accredited institutions reported research productivity. Thirteen of the sixty-seven did not report research in the quantifiable form explained above.

The writer utilized the arbitrary criteria for the establishment of a Research Involvement Scale and the remaining fifty-four schools were assigned such a value. The mean number of scale points for the fifty-four schools was 39.44.

One school had a Research Involvement Scale Value of 231 while four were assigned a value above 150. Because of these and other extremely high Research Involvement Scale values, a cut-off point was established at twenty-six. Only those institutions which had a scale value of twenty-six or more points were selected for further study.

Criteria for Selection of Institutions for Further Study. Twenty-three institutions satisfied the following

criteria and were selected for invitations to participate further:

1. Responded to the Initial Survey Questionnaire;

2. Had a college-controlled laboratory school;

3. Indicated research activity at or above the Research Involvement Scale of twenty-six;

4. Appeared on the NCATE Eighteenth List 1971-72;

5. Accepted the invitation to participate further in the study.

A personal letter was sent to the official who responded to the Initial Survey Questionnaire for each of the twenty-three selected institutions. Enclosed with the letter was a form for the official to use to indicate whether the officials of the institution wished to participate further in the study.

Of the twenty-three institutions invited to participate further, twenty-one responded. Seventeen agreed to participate, four declined and two did not respond.

After receiving forms indicating agreement to participate further from the seventeen selected institutions, schedule forms were sent to the officials in those participating institutions for detailed reporting of research conducted during the last five years.

In addition to the schedule forms, a Taped Response

Schedule and a blank cassette tape were included. The questions on the Taped Response Schedule were included to gather data not requested on the other schedule forms.

With these data gathered by procedures described above, the study was completed according to the plan outlined under the organization of the study which follows.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The introduction to the study has been presented in Chapter I. This included The Purpose of the Study, The Problem, Delimitations, Definition of Terms, and General Procedures followed in conducting the study.

A review of available related literature has been presented in Chapter II. The literature was presented in a historical manner with primary emphasis given to related dissertations or studies.

Chapter III dealt largely with the presentation and analysis of the data gathered for the study. Information taken from the Schedules including the Taped Schedule was utilized to present a "composite model" of the college-controlled laboratory school productive in research. Then, a summary of the Taped Response Schedule and a summary of the research reported was presented.

Chapter IV has been introduced with a summary of the study. Next, a comparison of the results of the study has

been made with the results of other related studies. Finally, certain conclusions were drawn concerning the data, and recommendations were offered.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

EARLY HISTORY OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

The laboratory school had its beginning in Europe during the seventeenth century. Much of the history of the present day laboratory schools can be traced to early seminaries and the normal school movement (Kelley, 1967).

In 1698, Frederick II of Gotha established ten teachers' seminaries where teaching skills were tried on fellow students (Williams, 1942). The first teacher training school in the German States was established in 1697 by Augustus Franche at Halle (Cubberley, 1920). Students at Halle observed classes taught by other students. Basedow required student teaching for the training of teachers at Dessau, Germany, as early as 1774. Student teaching was also required at the Institute at Yverdon, Switzerland, where Pestalozzian concepts and theories were formulated (McCarrel, 1934).

In 1788, the first state-supported institution for the preparation of teachers was founded in Berlin. Student

teaching and laboratory experiences were required parts of the curriculum.

Early laboratory experiences in the United States began in privately-operated schools. McCarrel (1934) stated that such experiences probably took place in Indian public schools of the Franciscan fathers as early as 1600.

Private normal schools in America also preceded similar state-supported institutions. In 1823, the first private normal school was opened in Concord, Vermont, by the Reverend Samuel Hall. Demonstration and practice teaching experiences were provided for the students in training (Stone, 1923).

The Reverend Thomas Gallaudet of Connecticut offered a plan in 1825 which recommended that all students training to become teachers be required to have practice teaching experience in a training school (Williams, 1942).

James G. Carter, sometimes called "the father of the normal school in the United States," wrote several articles in 1824-25 for the Boston Patriot strongly recommending practice schools in all seminaries for teachers. The second private normal school in the United States was opened by Carter in 1827 (Cubberley, 1934). Henry Barnard, writing in his "First Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of

Commissioners of Common Schools in Connecticut" in 1839, recommended that teacher training institutions operate model schools.

Perrodin (1955:4) stated that "from its earliest beginnings, a distinctive feature of teacher education has been the use of an actual school for children." Ashmore (1950:4) supported this view and offered the following statement:

> . . . from the earliest beginning of teacher education in the United States the concept of practice-teaching has been in evidence. . . . There has never been a period in the United States when the importance of providing laboratory facilities was minimized.

Legislation by the Massachusetts State Legislature in 1838 authorized the establishment of the first three state-supported normal schools in the United States. The first of these was opened at Lexington in 1839, the second during the same year at Barre and the third at Bridgewater in 1840 (Cubberley, 1920).

An experimental school became a part of the first state normal school in New York in 1836 (Williams, 1942). Laboratory school facilities were later required by state laws passed to establish normal schools. In 1857, a bill passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature provided for the establishment of normal schools only in towns or cities where model schools were located (Williams, 1942).

The importance of the model school in teacher education was discussed at the First Annual Convention of the American Normal School Association in 1859. As reported by Williams (1942:10), a resolution adopted stated:

> Resolved that this education of teachers should not only be theoretical, but also practical; and that to this end there should either be a school of observation and practice in immediate connection with the normal school and under the same Board of Control, or there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice.

Much of the European influence on American teacher education can be traced to the Institute at Yverdon, Switzerland, and to the "Oswego Movement" in America (Ashmore, 1950).

In 1861 the establishment of the Primary Teacher Training School at Oswego, New York, marked the beginning of an important period in the development and expansion of the normal schools and campus laboratory schools.

Although the Civil War had a marked effect on the growth and development of the American educational system, only three state normal schools closed during the time.

Both normal schools and laboratory schools experienced rapid increase after 1865. It was reported by the U. S. Commissioner of Education in 1874 that forty-seven of the sixty-seven state normal schools operated laboratory schools in connection with their teacher education programs (Perrodin,

1955). Cubberley (1934) reported that by 1910 there were approximately two hundred public normal schools and seventy-five private normal schools in the United States.

In 1917, the American Association of Teachers Colleges was organized. The growth and development of this organization resulted in an increase in the number of laboratory schools and an increased emphasis on standards in teacher education. Williams (1942:12) cited the following standard which was adopted by the Association at its annual meeting in 1926:

> Each teachers college shall maintain a training school under its own control, as a part of its organization, as a laboratory school for purposes of observing, demonstration, and supervised teaching on the part of the students [sic]. The use of an urban or rural school to permit carrying out the educational policy of the college to a sufficient degree for the conduct of effective student teaching will satisfy this requirement.

Blair (1958) stated that the laboratory school, as it is known today, has evolved since 1850. Several types of these schools have been identified from that time to the present. Blair (1958:2) named at least five general types of laboratory schools that have been distinguishable:

1. The practice school
2. The model school
3. The demonstration school
4. The training school
5. The experimental or child study school.

Kelley (1967) stated that the foregoing types of schools did not develop in a strictly chronological order,

nor could the schools be strictly categorized according to purpose or function. However, it seemed clear that the names denoted a function or purpose and through the years these names were changed to meet the changing educational policies or functions of laboratory schools.

In 1883 Colonel Francis Parker became principal of the Cook County Normal School. Hughes (1959) stated that the training school of this institution was probably the first of the experimental-type laboratory schools. Parker was a leader in experimentation, curriculum development, and reform from 1883 to 1901, although he consistently received opposition from many politicians and teachers.

The Horace Mann School, associated with Teachers College, New York City, began in 1887 as one in which "professors of education might experiment with the curriculum and methods of teaching as professors of science experiment in the laboratory" (Perrodin, 1955:8).

From its inception in 1886, the John Dewey Laboratory School focused on scientific investigation and research. Cubberley (1934:547) cited the following on the subject:

> In 1904, Dewey said of the Laboratory School, then become a part of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, that it had been operated "especially for the purpose of scientific investigation and research into the problems connected with the psychology and sociology of education." Its aim was to further the application of scientific concepts and methods to the conduct of school work.

In 1909, under the direction of Charles H. Judd, the laboratory schools of the University of Chicago, while continuing a strong interest in child activities and growth, began a program with emphasis on an analysis of the learning processes under laboratory conditions. Judd, as Director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, provided the leadership that resulted in analysis of learning in reading, handwriting, and arithmetic and the use of this data in planning new teaching procedures (Cubberley, 1934).

Teachers College opened its second laboratory school, the Speyer School, in 1899. It was unlike most laboratory schools of its time in that it did not charge tuition.

The principal purpose of the school was to achieve social efficiency through a variety of educational activities adapted to meet the needs of the local community.

Teachers College founded its third laboratory school, the Lincoln School, in 1917. Under the direction of Otis Caldwell, the school focused its efforts on experimentation leading to the reorganization of subjects and methods already established in elementary and secondary education. Operating strictly as a laboratory school, no practice teaching was performed and only limited observation was permitted.

In 1941, the Lincoln School was merged with the Horace Mann School. The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of

School Experimentation, a new school, was organized in 1943 for cooperative curriculum experimentation.

Ohio State University opened its laboratory school in 1930 under the direction of Laura Zirbes, a former staff member of the Lincoln School. According to Ramseyer (1948), Zirbes believed that experimentation should be carried on in an atmosphere where teachers could study children and their problems without necessarily following plans and methods previously conceived by others.

Many universities and teachers colleges opened other experimental or laboratory schools for child study which produced a new kind of laboratory school considerably different in aims, functions, and purposes from the model, training, practice, or demonstration schools previously mentioned (Blair, 1958).

Experimentation in child study or experimental schools challenged existing standards, procedures and practices of learning and teaching. Considerable attention was given to the interests and motivation of the learner.

The work of E. I. F. Williams (1942) was one of the landmark studies of the laboratory school. He provided a carefully researched summary of the historical development of the laboratory school in terms of its European antecedents and its uniquely American features. He gave careful attention

to studies since 1900. Blackmon (1970:219) stated "that it would be difficult to overstate the effect of this study through the years on the development of the laboratory school." Perrodin (1955) provided a study found in the Thirty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Association for Student Teaching. Ashmore (1950) also conducted a study of the laboratory school. Evan Hugh Kelley (1967) wrote a historical study of the laboratory school for Laboratory Schools, U.S.A. based on his dissertation research. Another work on this subject was that of Norton (1926) dealing with the early origins of formal teacher training in the United States.

FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS

From the beginning of organized teacher-education programs, laboratory schools have had an important part in the preparation of teachers.

Although utilized primarily as a source of observation, participation, and supervised teaching experience in the pre-service education of teachers, laboratory schools have made significant contributions to the improvement of teacher education. Research and experimentation have been included in many laboratory schools.

Perrodin (1955) stated that there was no indication

that the need for laboratory schools was decreasing; rather, he indicated that the need for laboratory schools would increase.

Carrington (1941:64) provided data on 154 campus laboratory schools operated by teachers colleges and normal schools. Of the 154 campus laboratory schools that stated they had functions other than student teaching, the following was reported:

> 11 percent used campus laboratory schools for participation.
>
> 20 percent used campus laboratory schools for demonstration.
>
> 49 percent used campus laboratory schools for experimentation.
>
> 91 percent used laboratory schools for observation purposes.

Morgan (1946) stated that laboratory schools had neglected experimentation and research but that these should be functions of such schools; while Jaggers (1946) stressed the importance of practice-teaching under the supervision of master teachers in laboratory schools.

Ashmore (1950:11) stated that "at the present time, the main areas of use fall roughly into three categories: (1) observation, (2) student-teaching, and (3) experimentation and research."

Buckley (1952:201) in a report which was a synthesis of twenty-nine research studies and opinions from professional literature between the years 1945 and 1950, identified five actual and proposed functions of the campus school, as follows:

1. It functions as a "practice" school. Here the prospective teacher practices the art of teaching - student teaching.

2. It functions as a "model" school. Here the prospective teacher sees model teaching going on.

3. It functions as a school for "participation." Here the prospective teacher participates in a few, many, or all of the professional activities of the teacher and the school.

4. It functions as a "laboratory" school. Here we have the research and experimentation going on in methodology, human relationships, management, and the validation and production of school materials. The degree to which the prospective teacher shares in these activities varies from none to all.

5. It functions as a "leadership" school. Here we have the dynamic action-center for all of the schools in the area served by the institution supporting the campus school. The prospective teacher may share in none, some, or all of the activities.

Rucker (1952:108) in a study of 185 institutions, indicated the importance of functions associated with teacher education. The following data were gathered from the 185 institutions regarding six major activities:

175 or 94.5 percent used campus laboratory schools for observation.

173 or 93.5 percent used campus laboratory schools for student teaching.

160 or 86.4 percent used campus laboratory schools for demonstration.

155 or 85.7 percent used campus laboratory schools for participation.

69 or 37.2 percent used campus laboratory schools for research.

18 or 9.7 percent used campus laboratory schools for internships.

Rucker (1952) also reported that 105 institutions were increasing laboratory experiences other than student teaching; and thirty-seven schools indicated an increase in research activities. Sixty-eight schools reported an increase in student teaching; while forty-seven were reducing student teaching in their schools.

Regarding student teaching, Rucker (1952) noted that during the school year 1950-51 in a total of 113 institutions studied, seventeen limited student teaching to their campus schools; sixteen had student teaching in off-campus schools only; and eighty conducted student teaching in both campus and off-campus schools.

Perrodin (1955:29) in the Thirty-Fourth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, listed the functions of laboratory schools as: (1) observation and demonstration, (2) participation, (3) research, (4) leadership, and (5) student teaching.

Thurber (1955:30) offered the following conclusions

regarding the functions of the college-controlled laboratory school:

> 1. An excellent college-controlled laboratory school is an essential for colleges specializing in the preparation of teachers.
>
> 2. There should be a thorough system of coordination between the work of the college and the work of the college-controlled laboratory school.
>
> 3. Although differences in educational philosophy must be evident in any democratically-controlled institution, too much difference between theories taught in the college and practice evident in the laboratory school can only result in complete confusion for students who are immature in the profession.
>
> 4. College-controlled laboratory schools can and do serve varied purposes, but in general can be most effective as adjuncts to the college program of observation, participation, and post student teaching.
>
> 5. College-controlled laboratory schools can be and are administratively organized in a variety of ways. No one type of organization appears to be greatly superior to any other.

Myers (1958:4) cited the following as the four major functions of a laboratory school:

> . . . to provide first, the best possible program for the youngsters; second, a sound teacher education program; third, an adequate research program; and fourth, service to the university and to the state . . . .

Myers (1958:5) stressed the importance of the laboratory school in curriculum development. Regarding the development of curriculum he proposed the following:

> A research program should be the basic ingredient of curriculum development. It is our assumption that the research activities of a laboratory school should be guided by the needs of the program. It is also our

assumption that curriculum development based on research evidence is the best means of assuming increased learning by the students.

Wiles (1958) identified four major functions of laboratory schools. He stated that the laboratory school should provide a good program for the students enrolled; it should be an integral part of the teacher education program; the school should provide stimulation and service to other schools; and the laboratory school should be a part of the research program which increases available knowledge concerning the teaching-learning process. With these basic assumptions, Wiles (1958) stated that no laboratory school could fulfill its role completely unless provision was made for research.

Wiles (1958:25) summarized the role of the laboratory school in educational research by listing the following points:

1. Research in a college of education should be centered in a laboratory school;

2. Laboratory schools must engage in carefully-designed research if they are to receive professional and public support;

3. The staffs of the college and the laboratory school should cooperate in the formulation of the research program;

4. The research program should consist of carefully-planned, long-term projects which test underlying hypotheses;

5. The hypotheses tested should be the best we can develop regarding the instructional program, and the laboratory teacher's role should be to implement these hypotheses, not to collect data;

6. Laboratory schools should guide other schools in a state desiring to do research.

Lang (1959:43) noted a difference of opinion between what several influential organizations say should be and what is actually seen in most of the campus laboratory schools. He found that:

> In 75 campus laboratory schools, the primary purpose was student teaching, with only eight percent reporting experimentation and research as the primary purpose. Sixty-five percent reported research and experimentation as their leading secondary purpose.

As a result, he concluded that "experimentation as a secondary function has wide surface supports but when compared to actuality has little real meaning."

Nuzum (1959) expressed the view that the laboratory school was reflecting changing purposes of teacher education; and that results of these changes were being expressed in development of new functions for the laboratory school.

In a study of research in laboratory schools, Lamb (1960) reported that fifty-three of the 115 schools responding were engaged in a re-examination of the functions of the laboratory school.

According to Lamb's study, the most important functions of the laboratory school were student teaching, observations, participation, and demonstration. Practices observed in the laboratory schools seemed to be in keeping with the stated functions of the laboratory schools. Research

was not considered to be a major function of significance by laboratory school administrators in Lamb's study.

Lamb (1960:50) reported the following:

> 1. Laboratory schools are presently devoting major portions of time and energy to fulfilling the functions of student teaching, observation, demonstration, and participation.
>
> 2. Many faculty members and administrators see a need for redefinition of the role of the laboratory school. Maintenance of the laboratory school will be difficult to justify if it continues to serve functions which can be served equally well and at considerably less expense by public schools.
>
> 3. Laboratory schools are presently making contributions to research in the areas of curriculum and in certain aspects of school-community relations.
>
> 4. There is some agreement that the laboratory school teachers should be active participants in educational research and should be released from routine classroom duties in order to carry on research.
>
> 5. Laboratory school teachers are more competent contributors to research than has apparently been assumed. Both teachers and their principals in relatively large numbers expressed a need for specific help in research methodology.

Blackmon (1962) conducted an extensive survey of college-controlled laboratory schools including those from the NCATE Seventh List 1960-61. One hundred twenty-five NCATE approved institutions reported research within a five year period between 1955 and 1960. In addition to research as a function in 125 NCATE institutions, student teaching, observation, participation, demonstration, and provision for a good educational program for children were identified as functions.

Blackmon (1970:68) cited important changes in functions indicated by data from his study. He stated:

> . . . changes in titles indicated changes in functions. Research and experimentation are receiving more emphasis, with a slight trend toward becoming a co-equal or primary function. Laboratory experiences were offered at earlier levels in undergraduate teacher education programs. A trend toward increased participation of graduate students in laboratory school research studies was perceptible. Student teaching has declined somewhat in importance as a function in the selected schools studied.

Blackmon (1970:29), regarding the ranking of functions by laboratory school administrators, stated that "on the whole, as laboratory school administrators interviewed in 1962 indicated there would be, there has been an increase of research and experimentation in rank value, particularly in experimentation."

A study by Kelley (1964) was conducted to determine the status of college-controlled laboratory schools. Respondents from 186 institutions provided data regarding the relative importance of seven possible laboratory school functions. From these data, Kelley (1964:1) provided the following rank list:

1. Observation
2. Demonstration
3. Student Teaching
4. Participation
5. Experimentation
6. Research
7. In-Service Training

Although considerable attention has been given to the importance of research and experimentation as unique

functions of laboratory schools, of the 186 respondents from Kelley's study, only twenty-seven institutions listed either of these functions as of first importance in their schools. Interestingly, sixty-two institutions listed student teaching as the most important teacher education function of their laboratory school.

Howd and Browne (1970) reported increased emphasis on research, participation, experimentation and in-service education. In contrast, respondents in Kelley's 1964 study did not accept these four functions as being of major importance.

Lautenschlager (1970:5), referring to the laboratory school at Indiana State University, said, "the primary function of the Laboratory School is to provide a situation for college students to work with children in a school setting."

According to Hodges (1973:6), the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, University of Florida, has served the following four functions throughout the history of the school:

> 1. Service to the College of Education and, to a lesser degree, to other colleges of the University of Florida, in providing opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students to observe and work with children.
>
> 2. Provision of a facility within which faculty and students of the University of Florida could conduct research.
>
> 3. Service in the improvement of education in

Florida and the nation by demonstration of exemplary educational programs.

4. Provision of an excellent educational program for the students enrolled in the school.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE DIRECTION

By the early sixties, some observers felt that laboratory schools were in danger of being discontinued. Amid such reports of the closing of some laboratory schools, a search for new roles occurred.

Although laboratory schools had served colleges and universities in providing college students direct experiences with children, there has been a clear movement also to include a variety of experiences with children in public schools.

Professional dissatisfaction with the prevailing interpretation of "direct experiences" and the role of the laboratory school in teacher education had been indicated by some researchers.

Caswell (1949) voiced the conviction that the facilities used were too limited, their range too narrow, and the time too limited.

A study of student teachers by Flowers and others (1948) under the auspices of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and the Association for Student Teaching

published more than two decades ago had an influence on the more recent reorganization of laboratory experience programs and new directions for the roles of laboratory schools.

Emphasis was given to the need for more than one school for laboratory experiences. However, Flowers and others (1948:304) gave special attention to the role of the college-controlled laboratory school:

> In general, this school (or schools) should be a representative school in the sense of having a non-selected group of children or youth and a definite community setting, a staff of able teachers qualified to guide professional laboratory experiences, and a program that is dynamic and forward-looking. The school should be one in which the staff, the administration, and the community are willing to cooperate in making the school a situation serving the dual function of providing the best possible program for children and of providing desirable experiences for prospective teachers . . . .

With a desire to redesign their role to meet demands of both teacher education and public education, many laboratory schools have either changed their programs, or are in the process of doing so. In many institutions the laboratory school, while once considered a center for student teaching, has become a focal point for other laboratory experiences.

Rzepka (1962:28) stated that "although a variety of program patterns are seen to be emerging, there has been, and still is, a consistent and somewhat insistent demand for the campus school to become a research center."

Robert Ohm (1960:5), speaking before the Laboratory School Administrators Association, said:

> One of the emerging directions is the concept of the laboratory school as a center for developmental research. The view suggests that vigorous research of the type now possible and necessary in education and related fields requires a combination of training, skills, and time not generally available in a staff of a laboratory school. It also proposes that externally derived research results are not readily applicable to practice. A large area of unexplored territory exists between the bright idea or significant conclusions and its eventual incorporation into improved practice. The undiscovered problems of bringing practice in line with present knowledge is the proper domain of the laboratory schools. The area requires its own rationales, techniques, and special resources. Laboratory schools are uniquely situated to serve as a focus for the resources needed to do developmental research.

Lathrop and Beal (1964:94) proposed a redefining and established a priority of functions for the laboratory school in relation to the purposes and programs of the institution of which it is a part:

> If the campus school is to survive it must re-examine its objectives and functions, relating them to the broader purposes of the academic setting which exists. For many laboratory schools such a realignment of functions will mean a de-emphasis on responsibility for the education of continuous population of elementary or secondary school pupils, de-emphasis of "live" observation for teacher candidates, and substantially greater commitment to experimentation, innovation, demonstration and research. In most schools such a realignment of purposes will be agonizing, requiring re-establishment of long dormant relationships with academic faculty and school personnel.

As laboratory schools adjusted to expanding roles, Hunter (1970:14) cited two unresolved problems in education for consideration. One area was the ever present gap between knowledge gathered through research and application in the

classroom. The other was "the critical need for an experimental laboratory to refine or field-test theory in an environment uncontaminated by the very necessary restrictions imposed on public schools." She envisioned the laboratory school of the future as an institution designed for the resolution of these two problems.

According to Hunter (1970:14), any school adopting this expanded role would have the following functions:

1. Research, experimentation, and inquiry into the phenomena of education.

2. Dissemination of results of such activities.

3. Development of leaders in clinical practice.

4. Demonstration, observation, and other activities germane to the first three functions.

Aubertine (1972) proposed that laboratory schools are on the threshold of a new era, in which they can perform an invaluable function in the education of teachers in an area of research and experimentation.

Rapid advances in electronic technology facilitated the development of the computer and video-taping equipment. With the development of the computer, experiments with many variables can now be analyzed quickly and with greater control.

Aubertine (1972) viewed the development of video-taping in small portable units at a relatively low cost as

a new dimension to the process of preparing teachers. A teacher candidate could observe his or her teaching within minutes after a period of instruction for analysis.

Through the use of the co-variance analysis formula and regression equations, it has been possible to conduct research with small sample numbers of pupils in a school and still obtain reliable data.

The third event cited by Aubertine (1972) was micro-teaching, which involved a reduction of instruction in terms of time and number of pupils. He viewed this as another tool in teacher education programs.

The fourth development was the movement toward Performance-Based-Teacher-Education programs. According to Aubertine (1972:38), laboratory schools can perform a vital and unique part in the Performance-Based-Teacher-Education movement due to three features:

> 1. Geographical Location: Proximity to college personnel and resources enables the laboratory schools to participate in and to respond most readily to the development and testing of Performance-Based protocol materials and assessment instruments. The laboratory schools can also assist in developing and conducting Performance-Based training programs for supervising teachers in the field.
>
> 2. Continuity of Program: The laboratory schools, with careful planning and utilization of micro-teaching and video-taping capabilities, can provide greater continuity in the teacher education program, thus making the transition from academic to field phase more smooth for the candidates . . . .

3. Control Function of Program: . . . Through the continuous use of micro-teaching and video-taping within a clinical context, coupled with the use of computers, it is now possible for the laboratory schools to exercise a systematic monitoring procedure of each candidate's progress and development in teaching . . . .

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

From the review of literature it was noted that some institutions had begun to place greater emphasis upon research. Several institutions engaged in recent program changes or new developments regarding these functions will be cited.

The P. K. Yonge Laboratory School of the University of Florida assumed an expanded role in research following two decisions reached in 1969. Prior to this the school's functions had not been clearly defined. There had been varying emphases as the school sought to serve the College of Education and other colleges in the University. In April of 1969, the faculty of the College of Education adopted a report of a commission which had been established to study the laboratory school's role. The commission report proposed that the laboratory school's role be that of "a great center for experimentation in education," (Alexander, 1969:8).

The report more specifically recommended that:

1. A research and development program be established within the College of Education with basic state support. Long-range planning, programming, and budgeting for

> experimentation and research be carried out in the Laboratory School should be developed in relation to this program. Experimental input would be limited in such a way as not to upset the equilibrium in the school's program.
>
> 2. Funds, facilities, and personnel be provided that are adequate for effective planning, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of findings on a long-range consistent basis, through a definite College budget for research and development, including a markedly increased budget for the School.

As a result of a number of questions raised about the laboratory schools in Florida operated by the State University system, an advisory committee on laboratory schools was appointed to conduct a study of laboratory schools and offer recommendations relative to their future.

The report of the committee (Moorer, 1969:4) concluded:

> . . . that the continuation of the campus laboratory schools could be justified only if their central mission became that of centers for research and high risk experimentation, shaply focused on the search for solutions to persistent problems in teaching and learning.

In accepting the challenge set forth, the P. K. Yonge school began in early 1969 to implement the new role as rapidly as possible. The faculty (Hodges, 1973:10) sought answers to the following questions:

> 1. How can the pupil mix be changed in order to be more representative of the state's school-age population?
>
> 2. How can resources in staff and funds be re-allocated to provide for the research and development function?
>
> 3. How can the school plant and facilities, already

loaded to capacity, be adjusted to accommodate research and development adequately?

4. What guidelines will serve as the basis for decisions relative to the research and development program?

The faculty interpreted their charge to be that of an agent for constructive change in public elementary and secondary education in Florida. It was recognized that forces opposing change were formidable and closing the gap between research findings and classroom practice would not be easy.

The school retained its traditional functions in teacher education with many programs for graduate and undergraduate students. Observation and pre-internship participation have been major programs, with increased emphasis upon practical experiences for graduate students in their areas of specialization (P. K. Yonge Self-Study, 1973).

Two programs in the laboratory schools of Illinois State University were described in the National Association of Laboratory Schools Newsletter, Spring, 1972.

Aubertine (1972) reported that the Metcalf Elementary Laboratory School and the University High School Laboratory School initiated micro-teaching clinics which are included as part of the elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs at Illinois State University. The clinic formats were linked to the methods courses in the respective programs;

and teacher candidates were engaged in the micro-teaching clinical experiences the semester before student teaching.

Both micro-teaching clinics were established with a three stage training process as follows:

> Stage 1 - Preparation: Planning a fifteen minute lesson incorporating a particular instructional skill or strategy or teaching with clinical supervisor.
>
> Stage 2 - Operation: Teaching the fifteen minute lesson before five or six laboratory school pupils plus video-taping of entire lesson.
>
> Stage 3 - Evaluation: Independent rating of the lesson by the clinical supervisor and student teacher, followed by observation of video-tape replay of the lesson (Aubertine, 1972:40).

Utilizing the basic format each laboratory school modified its clinic to fit particular needs and objectives of teacher education programs. Aubertine (1972) stated that it was anticipated that up to two hundred candidates could be enrolled each semester without affecting the quality of their training.

The success of the program was attributed to extensive planning and development, clinical supervisors' involvement in the planning, the development of pilot tests using small numbers of student teachers, the decision to establish a small scale program at first, and the decision to concentrate on a small number of basic teaching skills.

The agreement that the clinics would be only an additional experience and not a replacement for student

teaching was cited by Aubertine (1972) as a significant factor in the success of both clinics.

The Lida Lee Hall Learning Resources Research Center at Towson State College in Maryland began a new emphasis on research focusing on the problems of education according to Taylor (1971).

Among the opportunities for research at Lida Lee Hall Center, Taylor (1971:2) listed the following:

> 1. A full-time day care center for three and four year old children, working closely with the Early Childhood Department at Towson State College;
>
> 2. A nursery school program of three, four, and five year old groups of children, closely allied with the Early Childhood Department of Towson State College;
>
> 3. An educational media teaching and learning center emphasizing the development of learning stations which can be used independently by children in the three intermediate grade sections;
>
> 4. An experimental Parent Lounge focusing on the development of Parent-Teacher partnerships;
>
> 5. A fully equipped and staffed elementary reading center;
>
> 6. Special facilities and programs in art, music, physical education, drama, and speech.

In summary, laboratory schools have continually sought to identify their roles in teacher education programs. At times re-examination has required a major shift in emphasis to which some schools responded more rapidly than others.

Leadership in the research function has been given

by several institutions who have identified their role as that of becoming research centers to produce new theories and the translation of such theories into practice.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INITIAL SURVEY

Chapter III presents a summary of the findings of the Initial Survey Questionnaire. Sixty-seven institutions reported a college-controlled laboratory school and research activities during the past five years. Thirteen of these institutions did not report research in quantifiable form; and, therefore, the major part of this section considered the remaining fifty-four schools.

Twenty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico were represented among the sixty-seven NCATE-approved institutions. Alaska, Delaware, and Hawaii had no institutions on the NCATE Annual List 1971-72.

In Table 1 responses to the Initial Survey Questionnaire were presented. Seventy-four institutions reported a college-controlled laboratory school. Nine institutions reported recent closing or plans for closing their laboratory schools. This information was not requested; and therefore the number of laboratory schools recently closed

from among the 170 institutions reporting no college-controlled laboratory schools could not be determined.

Table 1

Summary of Responses to Initial Survey Questionnaire

Responses of Institutions	All from NCATE Annual List 1971-72
Had College-Controlled Laboratory School and Research	67
Had College-Controlled Laboratory School and No Research	7
Reported No College-Controlled Laboratory School	170
Reported Recent Closing or Planned Closing of Laboratory Schools	9
No Response	31
Total Surveys Mailed	284
Total Responding	253
Percentage Responding	89

Within the past five years, 1968 through 1972, according to their reports, 54 laboratory schools reporting research in quantifiable form had been involved in 190 published studies and 592 unpublished studies. A total of 338 studies were reported in progress; a total of 77 grants had been received during the five year period for research projects.

The majority of the studies mentioned were completed by laboratory school faculty members, college of education faculty members, and graduate students. Thirty-two institutions reported research studies completed by faculty members outside of education; eleven institutions reported some research studies completed under the direction of a bureau of research.

Table 2 contains a list of institutions among the 54 college-controlled laboratory schools which reported research activity with a Research Involvement Scale value of 26 or more. Institutions which agreed to participate further in the study were also identified in Table 2.

Data were studied in Table 3 and revealed the relationship that exists between research productivity and geographic location of the school in a state or region of the United States. Of the 23 institutions selected for further study, five were from the region of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 11 from the area within the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, six from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and one from the Western Association of Colleges and Schools. The five states with the highest mean RIS included one from the Southern Association, one from the Western Association, and three from the North Central Association. In considering

Table 2

Institutions with an RIS[1] of 26 or More

* Ball State University (Ind.)[2]
East Carolina University (N. C.)
* Illinois State University
* Indiana State University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kent State University (Ohio)
* Mankato State College (Minn.)
Morehead State University (Ky.)
State University of New York:
* College of Arts and Sciences at Plattsburgh
* College at Courtland
* College at Potsdam
* Tennessee Technological University
* Towson State College (Md.)
* University of California, Los Angeles
University of Chicago
* University of Florida
* University of Missouri
* University of Pittsburgh
* University of Northern Colorado
* University of Northern Iowa
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point
* Western Kentucky University
* Western Illinois University

[1]An (RIS) of 26 or more was required for an invitation to participate further in the study.

[2]Institutions indicated by an asterisk (*) were invited and agreed to participate further in the study.

Table 3

Responses of 54 Schools by State

State	Number of Schools	Average RIS*	Total RIS Points
Arkansas	1	12	12
Arizona	1	12	12
California	1	185	185
Colorado	1	37	37
Connecticut	1	7	7
District of Columbia	2	13	26
Florida	1	148	148
Idaho	1	17	17
Illinois	4	74.5	298
Indiana	3	69	207
Iowa	1	231	231
Kansas	1	15	15
Kentucky	4	24.8	99
Louisiana	2	13	26
Maryland	2	56	112
Massachusetts	1	17	17
Michigan	1	6	6
Minnesota	3	39.3	118
Missouri	2	24.5	49
New York	4	35.3	141
North Carolina	1	64	64
Ohio	2	47	94
Pennsylvania	4	17.4	69
Puerto Rico	1	6	6
Tennessee	4	18.3	61
Texas	1	10	10
Utah	1	7	7
Washington	1	12	12
Wisconsin	2	22	44
Totals	54		2,130
Average RIS		39.44	

*Research Involvement Scale

the total RIS points earned by states within regional accrediting associations, the North Central Association institutions accounted for 53 percent of the total RIS points. It was noted, however, that the North Central Association was comprised of 19 states while the next largest association, the Southern Association, encompassed only 11 states.

A study of data in Table 4 aided in discovering relationships between the quantity and kinds of studies reported and the location of the schools by states. The five states with the highest total studies reported represented three regional associations and included more than 41 percent of the total studies reported.

A study of data in Table 5 provided the range of grade levels reported by the 54 schools included in the study. Data were used to find relationships, if any, between research activity, range of grade levels reported, and location by states. Fifteen of the 54 schools reported a range of grades from one through twelve or greater. Of the 54 schools, 24 reported a grade range less inclusive than kindergarten through twelve, but including at least grades one through six. Among the 15 schools that reported a grade range of grades one through twelve or greater, 9 were located in the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Table 4

Studies Reported by 54 Schools by State

State	Published	Un-published	In Progress	Grants
Arizona	0	10	1	0
Arkansas	0	4	4	0
California	11	48	52	0
Colorado	6	7	6	0
Connecticut	0	1	1	1
District of Columbia	0	8	9	0
Florida	10	22	32	8
Idaho	0	3	3	2
Illinois	50	96	25	7
Indiana	25	45	13	15
Iowa	11	90	30	12
Kansas	0	1	1	3
Kentucky	18	15	11	2
Louisiana	0	12	7	1
Maryland	15	7	30	0
Massachusetts	0	3	3	2
Michigan	0	2	2	0
Minnesota	3	65	20	1
Missouri	9	16	3	0
New York	3	40	20	13
North Carolina	10	6	8	3
Ohio	6	50	9	2
Pennsylvania	5	9	14	3
Puerto Rico	0	4	1	0
Tennessee	5	10	18	0
Texas	0	2	2	1
Utah	1	0	0	1
Washington	0	8	2	0
Wisconsin	2	8	11	0
Totals	190	592	338	77

Table 5

Grade Levels Reported from
54 Schools by State

State	Grade or Age Levels	Number of Schools
Arkansas	N - K	1
Arizona	N - 6	1
California	N - 6	1
Colorado	K - 12	1
Connecticut	N - 6	1
District of Columbia	Birth to age 5	1
	Ungraded ages 14-20	1
Florida	N - 12	1
Idaho	N - 6	1
Illinois	N - 12	3
	N - 9	1
Indiana	K - 12	1
	N - 12	1
	K - 6	1
Iowa	N - 12	1
Kansas	N - 9	1
Kentucky	N - 12	1
	K - 12	1
	K - 6	2
Louisiana	K - 8	2
Maryland	N - 6	1
	N - K	1
Massachusetts	School for Handicapped (Nongraded)	1
Michigan	N - K	1
Minnesota	N - 12	1
	K - 6	2
Missouri	N - 12	1
	K - 12	1
New York	K - 8	1
	K - 9	1
	Grades 5,6,7,8 (Middle Schools)	1
	Ungraded ages 3-9	1
	Ages 3 - 11	1

Table 5 (continued)

State	Grade or Age Levels	Number of Schools
North Carolina	K - 6	1
Ohio	K - 9	1
	N	1
Pennsylvania	N - K	1
	N - 6	1
	N - 4	1
	K - 9	1
Puerto Rico	K - 6	1
Tennessee	1 - 12	1
	1 - 6	1
	N - 12	1
	K - 6	1
Texas	K - 8	1
Utah	K - 6	1
Washington	K - 6	1
Wisconsin	5 mos. to age 9	1
	Infants to age 6	1

Data were utilized in Table 6 to discover relationships between research activity and range of grade levels reported for the 23 institutions with an RIS of 26 or greater. A grade range of either kindergarten through grade twelve or nursery level through grade twelve was reported by 11 institutions. A grade range of kindergarten through grade six was reported by four of the institutions.

Table 6

Grade Levels Reported in Institutions
With an RIS of 26 or More

Grade or Age Levels	Number of Schools
K - 12	4
N - 12	7
K - 6	4
N - 9	1
K - 9	2
N - 6	1
Ages 3 - 11	1
Ages 5 months to 9 years	1
Ungraded ages 3 - 9	1
Grades 5 - 8	1
Ages 3 - 12	1

A study of data in Table 7 provided a distribution of the initial survey data by RIS and grade level for the 54 laboratory schools reporting quantifiable research. It was noted that the 23 schools with an RIS of 26 or greater had a total RIS point value of 1,770 for an average RIS of 76.9. Of the 23 schools with an RIS of 26 or greater, 11 reported a grade range of kindergarten through grade twelve or more. These eleven schools had the highest mean RIS of 94.9 and accounted for 59 percent of the 1,770 RIS points assigned the 23 schools.

Table 7

Initial Survey Data by RIS and Grade Levels of 54 Schools

Number of Schools	Categories	Total of RIS's	Average RIS
54	All schools reporting research activity	2,130	39.4
41	All schools with a combination of grades less inclusive than 1 - 12	1,072	26.1
23	All schools reporting an RIS of 26 or more	1,770	76.9
14	All schools reporting grades K -12 or more	1,072	76.5
11	All schools with an RIS of 26 or more reporting grades K - 12 or more	1,044	94.9
9	All schools with an RIS of 26 or more reporting grades included in N - 8	580	64.4

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER

Following an analysis of the data from the 253 responses to the Initial Survey Questionnaire, 23 institutions were selected to receive invitations to participate further in the study. The selection was based on the

criteria presented in Chapter I. The 23 institutions were identified in Table 2.

Four institutions declined the invitation; two did not respond; and seventeen agreed to engage in the study. Each of the seventeen institutions which indicated a willingness to proceed was sent an individually prepared cover letter with the Schedules for Reporting Laboratory School Research. Each institution was also sent a Taped Response Schedule and a blank cassette tape for use in responding to the items on the schedule.

A SUMMARY OF RESEARCH REPORTED

The seventeen laboratory schools selected for this part of the study reported 764 studies during the last five years. Of these, 148 were published studies; 394 unpublished; and 222 were studies in progress.

The studies reported by the seventeen schools on Schedules for Reporting Laboratory School Research were placed in the following categories:

Curriculum	176
Evaluation	88
Human Growth and Development Personality and Learning Theory	131
Instructional Organization	71
Teacher Education	30

The relative importance of the areas of investigation was indicated for the 496 studies by the arbitrary classification. The concerns of the researchers seemed to focus on the disciplines associated with education and the behavior of the learner.

A SUMMARY OF TAPED RESPONSE SCHEDULES

This section was based on data gathered by use of a Taped Response Schedule and the Initial Survey Questionnaire. The "composite model" was presented in an attempt to provide a view of the seventeen NCATE-accredited, college-controlled, laboratory schools selected for study. These seventeen schools reported a volume of research yielding Research Involvement Scale ratings ranging from 26 to 231.

Nine of seventeen schools reported a range in grades from nursery or kindergarten level through grade twelve; four schools had a range from nursery or kindergarten through grade six; while the remaining had ranges between nursery school and grade ten. Enrollments ranged from a low of 196 students to a high of 1,150 students. Of nine schools with a grade range of nursery or kindergarten through grade twelve, eight had an enrollment of more than 500 students.

The format for the following summary of taped responses was the format of the Taped Response Schedule

used in gathering data from the laboratory school officials.

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

The communities represented ranged from rather small rural communities to large metropolitan areas. More than half of the schools were located in communities of less than 85,000 inhabitants. Most of the schools reported that their selection process involved some attempt to provide a population similar to that found in other public schools in the community. Several of the schools indicated that preference was given to children of faculty or staff, or other members of families having children enrolled in the school. Only one school reported an admission policy strictly by date of application. The responses indicated that provision for a heterogeneous student population was considered important in conducting research.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

Research had been a major function for six years or less in six of the institutions. Other respondents cited many years of research productivity in their schools. Twelve school officials cited an increased emphasis on research in the last few years.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school?

Officials from eight of the seventeen schools stated that their schools had an official policy statement regarding research. Five of the remaining officials indicated that the policy was a part of their statement of purposes. A policy statement was being prepared by two of the institutions. Schools with official policy statements did not exhibit greater research productivity than schools with less formal research policies.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

Research was ranked among the first three functions by twelve of the officials reporting. Five officials gave research a rank of four, following demonstration, participation, observation, or service to area schools. Three officials commented that ranking was difficult since research was important to the other functions. Three institutions ranked research as their most important function. Twelve of the respondents considered service to teacher education through demonstration or participation as their first or second function. Schools which ranked research among the first three functions were productive in research with an average RIS of 108.

5. Do you feel that the laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question number four above?

An affirmative answer to this question was given by nine administrators. One respondent indicated that research was not in keeping with the ranking indicated because a researcher was not assigned to the staff. Another official stated that research was being de-emphasized as other functions required more time of the staff. One administrator reported that other functions were being phased out so that more time could be devoted to research.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The active interest of administration and faculty was cited as a facilitating factor. One respondent stated that in the area of research, nothing could replace a faculty member with an idea and the ability to develop hypotheses and techniques for testing hypotheses. Several officials cited the availability of graduate students with an interest in research leading to a degree as an important factor in research productivity. The focus upon research by their particular schools was identified as a major facilitating factor by two respondents. One official mentioned a

consortium of four colleges which provided opportunities for sharing which aided their research efforts. Leadership by curriculum directors or research directors was seen by three officials as a major factor contributing to research efforts in their institutions. Excellent relationships with colleges of education and other colleges on campus was cited by four officials as a positive factor in research efforts. The availability of funds was mentioned by four respondents as a major facilitating factor.

Of all the responses cited, the interest, ability, and availability of faculty and staff were cited most often as important facilitating factors.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

Six officials cited large university enrollments in teacher education programs which resulted in heavy teaching loads, or increased demands for pre-student teaching participation and demonstration responsibilities as factors which hindered research. Single class sections in laboratory schools or small numbers of students was mentioned by two officials as hindering research. Several administrators felt that faculties had generally been employed for their skill as teachers and not researchers. This led to a lack of

researchers in the laboratory schools and had an inhibiting effect on research productivity. One respondent noted communication problems arising between some researchers and teachers as research designs were prepared. Administrative reorganization was cited by five officials as a factor which hindered research efforts. Lack of physical and monetary resources were also mentioned by five respondents as inhibiting research.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Dissemination through periodicals either by the laboratory school or controlling colleges of education was the most frequently cited method. Several respondents reported that duplication and distribution was largely internal or upon request from interested persons. Most administrators mentioned the availability of theses or dissertations on file in their university libraries. Publications and circulation by individual researchers were also cited as a means of dissemination. Other means employed frequently for dissemination were conferences, in-service meetings and other professional meetings. Only one respondent reported no formal dissemination; however, seven officials reported dissemination procedures inadequate and viewed this inadequacy as a weakness in their program.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

All respondents indicated a need for increased staff and/or better staffing through released time for research by faculty members. Space for research, the addition of special assistants to gather data, and secretarial assistance were mentioned by ten officials as changes that would be implemented. Funds for the dissemination of findings was cited as a serious need by four officials. One official stated that he would employ faculty members who were "on fire" with ideas that could be researched. Another said that a research person should be assigned solely to research with an adequate staff to gather and disseminate results.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this school?

The list of persons or groups initiating research at the various institutions included faculty members from colleges other than colleges of education, faculty members from other universities, administrators of the laboratory schools, laboratory school faculty, graduate students in master's or doctoral programs, and college of education faculty. Three officials indicated that almost anyone with a good idea and an interest in research could initiate

research in laboratory schools. Several respondents indicated that most research was conducted by persons outside the laboratory school. One official took the position that research should be conducted by trained researchers working with teachers as the teachers work with children.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given released time or other compensation for such research activity?

A negative reply to this question was given by seven of the officials responding. Nine officials, however, stated that they did not encourage full-time faculty members to engage in research but believed it the work of full-time researchers. The remaining respondents indicated that various arrangements for released time or other compensation were granted to faculty members engaged in research. Several institutions employed one or more faculty members with reduced teaching loads to conduct or assist in research.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

All but two of the officials responding said "no" to this question. Those responding affirmatively qualified their replies by saying that some limited research was possible and helpful. An opinion of one administrator suggested that one could not be a full-time teacher and

conduct research, but a full-time teacher could be creating ideas that might evolve as problems for research.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

None of the institutions responding listed research capability as a necessary criterion for the employment of faculty. However, several cited the desirability of research capability. Most officials cited innovative, creative and flexible teachers as desirable faculty members. One respondent indicated that greater emphasis probably would be placed on research ability in the future.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

Thirteen officials cited certain unique aspects of the research function in laboratory schools. The following responses serve as examples:

> We have had great freedom to change our program and we have had greater control over factors than you might have in another situation. I think the sense of control and being able to alter plans gives us a unique freedom that you cannot find in a public school.

> Yes, because of its live, viable and dynamic nature with (a) prototype environment for implementation, (b) because of the realistic blending of theory and practice which is not characteristic of pure research, (c) the committed personal and professional motivation of the researcher.

> One of the things about our laboratory school set-up that is unique . . . is that it is possible for a student to go from pre-kindergarten through high school in one of our laboratory schools; therefore, we have an excellent chance to develop studies and to keep records all along the way.
>
> I think it is important to add one issue. It is not the programs in campus schools which will have such an impact, but experimental, innovative programs may lead to research which can be of assistance to public education.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

Many types of research were suggested as appropriate for laboratory schools including longitudinal studies, studies of learning theories, behavior modification, organizational patterns, needs of learners, and studies dealing with social interactions. Most of the administrators stressed the important functions of the laboratory school in providing research the results of which could be implemented in public schools. Several respondents cited the excellent opportunity of psychology departments to conduct research in a more "controlled" setting with students in campus laboratory schools. There was general agreement that laboratory schools should conduct research which might be more difficult to conduct in a public school setting.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

Laboratory school research was financed in many ways, including provision within the college of education budget, grants from various agencies, university research budgetary arrangements, and some through regular laboratory school budgets. One form of support was the payment of partial or full salaries of persons assigned for research in the laboratory schools or colleges of education. Several officials cited no specific support funds for research.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

Several officials noted the unique opportunity for laboratory schools to establish greater cooperation between teachers of methods courses or psychologists working closely with laboratory school teachers in developing research programs and testing ideas that were common to college professors and to the laboratory school teachers. The lack of cooperation between college of education faculties and laboratory school personnel was cited by several administrators. One official stated that the problem in their school was the result of negative responses on the part of the laboratory school staff to some previous requests for research which laboratory school personnel felt might have been detrimental to the students or to the ongoing program

in the laboratory school. Two officials felt that the continued support for laboratory schools in research would require a balance of service output for the local and academic communities with emphasis on local schools and community. Several respondents felt that more research was needed on the part of laboratory schools but such research was dependent upon better financial support. One official voiced his belief that the closing of some laboratory schools came as a result of inadequate research productivity.

The administrators indicated that laboratory schools were increasing their research efforts and stated that this would continue to be a trend in the future.

One administrator offered the following comments:

> I feel that it is very important that laboratory schools remain alive, whether they serve the research function or whether they serve as a model school; because I think it has been proven that public schools have their own vested interests, naturally, to protect their public image. It is very difficult for them to remain flexible enough to allow individual researchers to come in without a great deal of "hassle"; and educators and psychologists need to have places where they can try out new ideas and conduct some investigations.

In summary, the laboratory school administrators indicated that laboratory schools served a unique function as research centers where the testing of new ideas dealing with curricula, materials, methods, organizational

arrangements and human growth and development should be conducted and results disseminated. They felt that greater support was needed and yet most were optimistic about the growth for the future in the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This study was conducted in an attempt to identify practices, conditions and arrangements which were associated with research productivity in selected college-controlled laboratory schools.

The sources utilized to provide data for the study were: a review of related literature, an initial survey questionnaire mailed to 284 institutions from the NCATE Annual List 1971-72, schedules for reporting the research activities of selected schools, and taped response schedules from laboratory school officials.

The historical development was traced including original purposes, functions, implications for future direction, and recent developments in relation to purposes and goals of teacher education programs.

Two hundred eighty-four institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education were surveyed by questionnaire to identify the institutions

with college-controlled laboratory schools which had been engaged in research activity within the past five years. From a total of sixty-seven institutions reporting research on the initial questionnaire, twenty-three satisfied the criteria presented in Chapter I for selection to participate further in the study. On the basis of responses to invitations to participate further in the study, seventeen were selected from the twenty-three who were invited.

These institutions were sent the schedule for reporting research, a taped response schedule, and a blank cassette tape to be utilized, if desired, in responding to the questions on the taped response schedule.

The taped responses were transcribed for analysis. The initial survey questionnaires, schedules for reporting research, and taped responses were analyzed as summaries and certain data were arranged into tables. Those summaries and tables were presented in Chapter III. The conclusions and recommendations formulated as a result of the study were presented in Chapter IV. The following section provided a comparison of the results of this study with Blackmon's (1962) study.

A STUDY OF FINDINGS

Blackmon (1962) conducted a study of the research functions in college-controlled laboratory schools.

Blackmon's findings and the findings of this study were compared in an attempt to identify changes which seemed to have taken place since the 1962 study.

The present study identified only NCATE-accredited institutions while Blackmon began with a larger number of institutions but narrowed his study to NCATE-accredited institutions after analysis of his preliminary survey. Blackmon reported 125 NCATE-accredited institutions which indicated research activity while the present study revealed 67 such institutions. This difference might be explained by the fact that Blackmon's (1962) study included NCATE institutions which did not offer graduate programs while the present study was limited to those NCATE-accredited institutions offering graduate programs. Another explanation for the smaller number reporting research may be found in the closing in recent years of a number of laboratory schools.

Of the 343 NCATE schools included in Blackmon's survey, 307, or approximately 89 percent responded. From the 284 NCATE schools included in the present survey, 253, or approximately 89 percent responded.

Blackmon (1962:59) reported the following research studies or projects from 125 NCATE-accredited institutions for the five years prior to his study: 353 studies unpublished, 274 studies in progress, 151 studies published, and

47 studies involving grants. By contrast, the present study revealed that the selected seventeen NCATE-accredited schools reported the following research projects conducted during the past five years: 394 studies unpublished, 222 studies in progress, 148 published studies, and 49 studies involving grants. Evidence from the comparison indicated that 17 schools in 1972 reported more research in two of the categories than 125 similar institutions reported in 1962.

In Blackmon's study, all of the twenty-three institutions invited to participate further had grade ranges of at least grades one through twelve. In the present study only eleven of the twenty-three institutions reported grade ranges of either kindergarten or grade one through twelve.

In order to make comparisons, the writer established the same criteria for the Research Involvement Scale (RIS) in the present study as Blackmon (1962) used in his study for the Research Activity Index (RAI). In Blackmon's (1962) study the average number of points for the 112 schools reporting was 13.7 while the average number of points for the 54 schools reporting in the present study was 39.44.

Blackmon (1962) reported an RAI of 40.0 for all schools with grades one through twelve. In the present study all schools with grades kindergarten or grades one through twelve had an RIS of 76.5.

Data from these two studies revealed that research productivity in laboratory schools operated by some NCATE-accredited institutions has increased markedly during the past ten years.

Regarding factors, conditions, or other arrangements which seemed to facilitate research, both studies reported many of the same factors. The same was true for factors which seemed to hinder research. However, the administrators in Blackmon's (1962) study felt that the fact that the main business of any school was the education of children might be an inhibiting factor to research. They also felt that parents of laboratory school children tended to be more "vocal," thus hindering research. Administrators in the present study noted neither of these conditions as hinderances; rather, they cited "understanding" parents as a favorable factor for productive research efforts.

Although research efforts apparently have increased in many laboratory schools during recent years, some such problems as lack of funds, time, and facilities were reported in 1962 and again in 1972 as hindering productive research.

CONCLUSIONS

The writer made the following basic assumptions at the beginning of the study:

(1) Research was identified as a major function by some college-controlled laboratory schools.

(2) Quality research was a product of some of the college-controlled laboratory schools identifying research as a major function.

(3) Laboratory schools which were active and productive in research efforts followed certain policies or practices which seemed conducive to the success of the research.

Data from this study supported these assumptions. Regarding the third assumption, however, it was not possible to equate productive research with a particular model or type of school exhibiting specific factors or conditions which seemed to facilitate research.

Although schools reporting at least twelve grades were usually productive in research, there were many schools with other grade patterns which were also active in research efforts.

An examination of the data revealed that several new laboratory schools have been established whose major aims were to focus upon becoming productive research centers. Many of these had publications devoted to the orderly dissemination of research results.

Several important changes were noted in the functions of laboratory schools. Student teaching was reported as

either removed from the responsibility of the laboratory school or reduced to a minor function. Pre-teaching experiences, observation, and demonstration remained as major functions of most laboratory schools. An increased emphasis on research was noted as an apparent trend with this function ranking first, second, or third in most institutions.

Several factors seemed to contribute to the increased interest and emphasis on the research function in laboratory schools. State governing authorities or university boards of regents have in many cases charged laboratory schools with the responsibility of becoming productive research centers. Leadership provided by research directors and funds through grants were often cited as factors facilitating research.

Although considerable interest and productivity in research were reported, some factors have hindered research. Factors mentioned most frequently had to do with physical and monetary resources. Most institutions indicated a need for additional qualified research personnel and for additional physical facilities to be utilized in research.

Many laboratory schools were disseminating research conducted in their schools through newsletters or other publications. However, a lack of adequate dissemination was apparent as data from some schools indicated insufficient

funds for proper dissemination of studies. According to data gathered in the study, some research reports were not disseminated or reported.

Better rapport and communication between facilities of laboratory schools and departments or colleges of education were major concerns of several administrators. A need for better exchange of ideas and greater involvement was mentioned by several officials.

Data indicated that college-controlled laboratory schools can serve as unique centers for experimentation and research. Much research has been conducted by college-controlled laboratory schools; and administrators of the selected schools regarded college-controlled laboratory schools as uniquely capable of research not possible in public schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Results of this study seem to have indicated that the following recommendations are in order:

(1) A staff including a research director and clerical assistance should be provided.

(2) Provision should be made for adequate financial support of research.

(3) A competent faculty interested in research productivity should be selected.

(4) Adequate funding and staff for the dissemination of research findings should be available.

(5) Control over the nature and size of the student population would be warranted.

(6) Multiple sections of each grade within the laboratory school for research studies would appear necessary.

(7) Administrators, deans and department heads, and other officials, should give serious attention to the matter of improving morale and rapport through concerted efforts to effect better communication and coordination between laboratory school faculties and colleges of education.

(8) Researchers from various disciplines within teacher education programs should identify ways of working together toward goals of mutual concern to laboratory school personnel and researchers.

(9) Research should be promulgated through media of communication such as tapes, films, lectures, seminars, articles, dissertations, and published bulletins.

(10) The National Association of Laboratory Schools should continue encouraging research in college-controlled laboratory schools and assist in the dissemination of resulting data to its membership and to other interested parties.

REFERENCES CITED

Alexander, William M. January, 1969. "Report of the Committee on the Role of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School," University of Florida, Gainesville.

Ashmore, Henry Ludlow. 1950. "An Evaluation of State-Supported Campus Laboratory Schools in Selected Southeastern States," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Aubertine, Horace E. Spring, 1972. "The Renaissance of the Laboratory Schools," National Association of Laboratory Schools Newsletter, 14:35-46, No. 1.

Barnard, Henry. June, 1839. "First Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Commissioners of Common Schools in Connecticut," Connecticut Common School Journal, 1:174.

Blackmon, Charles Robert. 1962. "The Research Function in Selected College-Controlled Laboratory Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.

_____. (ed.) 1970. Laboratory Schools, U. S. A. Studies and Readings, Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Blair, L. C., Dwight E. Curtis, and A. C. Moon. 1958. The Purposes, Functions, and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School, AST Bulletin No. 9, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: National Association for Student Teaching.

Buckley, Harry E. September, 1952. "The Campus School: What Are Its Functions?" The Journal of Teacher Education, 3:201-203, No. 3.

Carrington, J. W. February, 1941. "Functions of Laboratory Schools Without Student Teachers," Twenty-First Annual Session: Atlantic City, N. J., Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: National Association of Supervisors of Student Teaching.

Caswell, Hollis J. April, 1949. "The Place of the Campus Laboratory School in the Education of Teachers," Teachers College Record, 50:441-450.

Cubberly, Ellwood P. 1920. The History of Education, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

_____. 1934. Public Education in the United States, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Flowers, John G., Alan Patterson, Florence Stratemeyer, and Margaret Lindsey. 1948. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, New York: American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Goodlad, John A. 1971. "The Role of Laboratory Schools in Service to Public Education," an address delivered to the National Association of Laboratory School Administrators in Chicago.

Hodges, J. B. (ed.) 1973. A Self Study of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, Gainesville, University of Florida.

Howd, M. Curtis and Kenneth A. Browne. 1969. National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools, Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hughes, Otto. March, 1959. "The Role of the Campus Laboratory School," Bulletin of the Indiana University School of Education, 35:1-48, No. 2.

Hunter, Madeline. September, 1970. "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:14-19.

Jaggers, Craddock H. March, 1946. "The Function of the Laboratory School," Peabody Journal of Education, 23: 276-279, No. 5.

Kelley, Evan Hugh. 1964. College Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

_____. 1967. "The Status of the Campus Laboratory School in the United States," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Lamb, Pose Maxine. 1960. "An Investigation of Educational Research in Selected (Elementary) Laboratory Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Lang, Duaine Charles. January, 1959. "Current Theory and Practice in Connection with the Function of the Campus Laboratory School," Educational Administration and Supervision, 45:36-43, No. 1.

Lathrop, Robert L. and Dallas K. Beal. 1964. "Current Status of Selected College Related Schools," Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center, NDEA Report 7B-374.

Lautenschlager, Harley. October, 1970. "Laboratory School Continues to Serve the University," Contemporary Education, 42:4-5.

McCarrel, Fred. 1934. The Development of the Training School, Abstract of Contributions to Education No. 126, Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers.

Moorer, Sam. December, 1969. "A Study of Campus Laboratory Schools in the State University System of Florida," State University System, Office for Academic Affairs, Tallahassee, Florida.

Morgan, W. P. February, 1946. "Teachers College Laboratory Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 27:167-168, No. 6.

Myers, Robert B. November, 1958. "The Role of the Laboratory School in Curriculum Development," in The Role of the Laboratory School in Teacher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Norton, A. O. (ed.) 1926. The First State Normal School in America: The Journals of Cyrus Pierce and May Swift, Vol. I, "Harvard Documents in the History of Education Series," Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nuzum, Lawrence Howard. 1959. "A Survey of Changes in Function of the College-Controlled Laboratory School from 1948 to 1958," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Ohm, Robert. January, 1960. The Laboratory School Administrators Association Newsletter, 11:1-12, No. 2

Perrodin, Alex F. (ed.) 1955. Function of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Thirty-fourth Yearbook, Lock Haven, Pa.: The Association for Student Teaching.

Ramseyer, John A. 1948. "A Study of School Improvement with an Emphasis upon the Role of the Laboratory School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Rucker, Winfred R. 1952. A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Rzepka, Louis. March, 1962. "The Campus School: Its Search for Identity," The Journal of Teacher Education, 13:24-29.

Stone, M. S. May, 1923. "The First Normal School in America," Teachers College Record, 24:263.

Taylor, Bernard G. (ed.) Spring, 1971. Probe, Maryland: Towson State College.

Thurber, Clara M. 1955. "The College-Controlled Laboratory School: Current Function," in Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Thirty-fourth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

Van Til, William. 1970. The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? Terre Haute: Indiana State University and the Laboratory Schools Administrators Association.

Wiles, Kimball. November, 1958. "The Role of the Laboratory School in Educational Research," in The Role of the Laboratory School in Teacher Education, Report of the Work Conference held at the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Williams, E. I. F. 1942. The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

APPENDIX I

TRANSCRIPTS OF TAPED RESPONSE SCHEDULES FROM OFFICIALS OF SELECTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS (ANONYMOUS)

Institution "A"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

   Our school serves an attendance district which is in the downtown area of _____. There are three railroad tracks running through our school district, which gives us a low socio-economic area. This attendance district provides about 30 to 50 percent of the student body. The rest of the student body comes through making application; and they live in any part of _____ County.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

   Research has been a function of this laboratory school to some degree for 20 years.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

   Our present official policy statement concerning research states "in order to discharge its abilities for staying abreast of and contributing to leading educational developments, the laboratory school faculty and administration cooperate with the college departments to plan, design, and conduct action research experiments on a wide variety of educational problems. New methods, techniques, materials, devices, evaluation procedures, or organizational, administrative, and guidance patterns, and analysis of learning factors and their effects on children, comprise a few of the possible research concerns.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

   The functions of our school are (1) basic purpose and only real reason for existence of the laboratory school is to serve the needs of teacher educators, both

pre-service and in-service levels; (2) corollary to this major function and absolutely necessary for its accomplishment is the provision of a modern education program for children and youth attending the laboratory school; (3) research; (4) to cooperate with other _____ public schools and to keep them informed of program developments going on in the laboratory school.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

I would say that the laboratory school has conducted research pretty much in keeping with the third place rank we have indicated as a function of this school.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

One of the primary factors in facilitating productive research in the laboratory school has been the hiring of staff who are eager to complete doctoral degrees. Also, the general atmosphere of the school has increasingly become one which encourages people to try out new ideas, to structure ideas into some rough research design, and write the findings for distribution among our own faculty, at least.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

In my opinion the leading factor that has hindered productive research in this laboratory school is not having someone on the staff who is skilled in designing research studies, helping to identify the kinds of data to be collected, and then handling the data statistically or systematically. A contributing factor would also be the reluctance of the university to free staff members some part of their teaching load so that they could pursue with greater vigor some ideas that they have.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Some other research ideas have been written for publication and have appeared in some widely circulated

magazines. Many of the dissertations have not been circulated other than through being placed in the university library and these are being made available to researchers throughout the United States. We have mimeographed a number of articles describing innovative practices, and have distributed them throughout the state of _____ through the State Department of Public Instruction.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

I would first hire a person competent to design research studies, help collect and handle data, and write a summary of the study in an attractive form for distribution to other interested people. I would make provision for a faculty member to have some release time to carry out a worthwhile research project.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

Research conducted in this school has been initiated by an individual in the school or by the director of the school.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for much research activity?

Faculty members have not been given release time or other compensation for any research activity. The only exception to this would be an occasional person has been granted a leave of absence with full pay for a semester or half pay for a year to complete graduate work which sometimes includes at least a partial writing of the dissertation.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I do think it is practical for a laboratory faculty member to be a full time teacher and to carry on research if the teacher has available an expert in research study,

a person who can help identify and collect data necessary, handle the data and write the report. I feel that teachers could be very much involved with conducting action research studies in their own classrooms without actually adding a great deal to the amount of preparation needed daily to do an excellent job of teaching.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

When employing faculty members in the laboratory school, we have not put the capability of conducting research as the most important factor in employing a teacher. We do consider this factor and probably in the future will give it higher rank than we have in the past.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

One aspect of the research function of this laboratory school that is unique is the fact that the school is operated by the state and has a reputation as being a school that is dedicated to innovation and investigation. Parents of the children accept quite readily any new ideas that teachers try out in their classrooms. The school is so situated that the school can make mistakes in conducting research without receiving a great deal of community pressure. Personnel need not be fearful of losing their jobs because some study turns out more negative than positive.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

The type of educational research that is most appropriate in this laboratory school program would seem to me to certainly include curriculum projects, observation and participation by college students, a setting for a number of kinds of research that might be directed by members of the psychology department or college professors, and perhaps various kinds of organizational structure or schedules of classes might be tried out in our school and if successful adopted by some public schools.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

It is financed through leaves of absence, individuals providing the money for their own research, and a small research fund in the university to which faculty members may present ideas and requests for supporting funds.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

Other research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which have not been covered in the questions above would relate to such things as college faculty members using students in the laboratory school to gather data for research in which they are interested. We have numerous occasions throughout the year for faculty members to conduct pilot studies in our classes as they develop and refine instruments which they wish to use with a wider audience. A number of what might be called small research studies are conducted by university faculty members by using students in this school inasmuch as it is much easier, as it is sometimes impossible to use students in the public schools. One other unique possibility for laboratory schools is for a greater degree of cooperation between people who are teaching methods courses, or psychologists working closely with laboratory school teachers in developing research programs, trying out ideas that are somewhat common to the college professor and to the laboratory school teacher. It is a stimulating environment in which change is much more readily accepted and pursued than in the public schools which I have known.

Institution "B"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

We are located in a high socio-economic community; however, our students come from about a ten-mile range surrounding this community and represent every child who could be in regular school. The only child we do not have in our school is the child from the rural area because we have none surrounding the school. We have no completely blind children and no wheel-chair children because we don't have the extra "pair of hands" that these children require. All ethnic groups are in our school. Our students are selected, by-and-large, by a first-come, first-serve basis. We sort our applicants, about 4,000 of them, into minority groups, professional groups, and non-professional groups. We select about one-third of our incoming students from each of those groups. In September we enroll approximately 50 new children as "old" three and "young" four year olds. Those children progress all the way through school and only when one of these children drops out do we replace him/her with another child from the waiting list. The only way a child is enrolled out of order is when he is presenting some unusual research problem.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

Research has been a function of this laboratory school ever since I came, which was ten years ago.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

Our official policy regarding research in the laboratory school is that it must be university-sponsored research. We work with approximately 18 different departments on campus. A brief form requesting permission to do research is supplied by the researcher. This is okayed by me on two bases. First, that the research is important in contributing something to education. We

simply do not have a population for use by every student who needs to write a term paper. The other qualification is that these children must not be so over-researched in time that we don't have any time to educate them. We try to have a certain amount of research going on in each area of the school, but not to the point where there is no time for regular schooling for these children.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

In order of importance, research is our primary function. After this, comes service to schools of _____ with a preparation of leadership in our school to extend that service. Many of our people are "skimmed off the top" of our staff to become superintendents, supervisors, college professors, and so forth. Next, we serve as a demonstration depot to visitors all over the world who want to see such things as individualized instruction, non-grading, team-teaching, and foreign language instruction in action. Also we are a demonstration center for the university when they want their students to see some aspect of boys and girls in a classroom and some curricula being developed.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

Yes, I feel that our school has conducted research in keeping with the rank indicated. However, we have no personnel assigned to research within the school. Consequently, much of it is done in late afternoon and evening and by burning the midnight oil. I feel that if a laboratory school is to function in this way, there should be personnel assigned to assume this responsibility.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

I believe the primary facilitators for productive research is a staff that is completely dedicated to furthering information and ideas in education. Our staff works very long hours without very great pay. It is their considerable dedication that has promoted this research. Many of the most important ideas that have emerged from our laboratory school, and some of the more important publications, are a result of the staff's own inquiry rather than that of professors on campus.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

I believe I have already indicated that one main factor that has hindered productive research has been the lack of personnel. I believe that the other factor is that much research is done in odd hours and by staff who at times would like to devote full-time to it. We do close our school two weeks out of the year, one in November and one in February to give the staff time to do some of these things. Ideally, we would like to have a double staff, half of them teaching and demonstrating and the other half developing new ideas.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Results of research in this laboratory school are disseminated primarily through educational publications. Our staff also does extensive in-service all over the English speaking world, and by their conducting workshops, they disseminate tremendously the ideas and the techniques of the school.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

I believe I have already suggested that we would have a double staff which would greatly increase research potential. The other thing, I believe would be important, would be for certain professors to be assigned directly to us to inquire into many of the things that we are doing. As it is, I monitor all research conducted by the many departments on campus - to comb them for anything that might be translated directly into educational change. It is through such kinds of monitoring that we began working with left-brain, right-brain kinds of learning and processing of learning and came out with a very productive teaching technique.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The people who initiate research may be doctoral candidates in any department on campus, professors on campus, and, of course, the staff of the school.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

We have no release time or other compensation for research activity by the staff.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I don't think it is practical for a faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research, although many of our people do. I have a feeling that we may be burning them out. It takes extreme dedication to work the hours necessary to do a good job in this area.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

The capability to do research is not considered at all in employing faculty members. We employ people who show potential for becoming master teachers. Our definition of a master teacher is a person who, given any group of boys and girls, can diagnose those children, prescribe for their learning, implement that prescription in real life, evaluate the success of that prescription, incorporate into that prescription all the principles of learning, articulate what he is doing at all times and transmit those skills to another person.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

I consider it a unique aspect of laboratory schools the fact that they are completely free to do research. They have a voluntary population. Consequently, there are no attachments by the public who are demanding a particular kind of education for their children, or who are asking that their children be excused from a particular kind of function. It is this complete freedom to do research in the laboratory school that makes it an important asset to the university.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

I see no type of educational research that I think not appropriate to use in a laboratory school program.

I do think, however, that laboratory schools ought to try to major in certain areas and not try to "cover the waterfront."

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

The professor who is doing research finances his own research, either as part of his regular teaching assignment or particular grant.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

I think my final comment about the research function of laboratory schools is that that function must extend further than it has in the past. We have picked all kinds of bits and pieces of knowledge and then published them and forgotten them. I think the most important factor yet to be completely researched is how do we get the quality of education that we now know how to produce into the public schools. I think that a laboratory school has to work constantly to develop a program which is possible in a regular public school, and then to do something to see that program implemented in a realistic way in the public program.

Institution "C"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

_____ is an industrial community located in east central _____. The population is about 80,000. The university has an enrollment of approximately 18,000 students, of which about 4000 are in graduate programs. Baccalaureate and master's degree programs are offered. The major interest of the university is teacher education. Laboratory school students come from two sources. Those in the elementary school who live in a geographical area adjacent to the laboratory school; and in grades K-12 and all students in grades 7-12 excepting those who live in the district and attended in K-6 are selected by application. Any student who lives in the _____ School district which includes the city of _____ and the townships surrounding the city may apply for admission to the laboratory school. The selection committee includes three members from the _____ Community schools and three from the university. The criteria of selection is to establish a school population which resembles the _____ community population. This has been accomplished reasonably well.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

Research has always been a function of this school. The school started in 1929.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

The only official statement concerning research is found in the statement of purpose of the laboratory school.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

In ranking functions of the laboratory school, we have always put as number one to provide a laboratory for teacher education; number two is to develop innovative

or experimental programs; number three has been research; and number four is possibly in-service programs. When we talk about a laboratory for teacher education, we include in that the functions of participation, observation, demonstration, and we felt that this was a major role. The function of in-service is important because people who are working in public schools get our university students for student teaching and to find opportunities to come to the laboratory school to help them with problems that they have in their community. We find it difficult to give rank order of our functions. You can see from our statement of roles that they are listed in a rank order.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

Yes, through value judgment.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

Principle factors are having faculty members who are competent to conduct research and are willing to put forth the energy necessary to bring it about. Another factor which we did not realize was as important until now is having money or funds enough to support research. For many years we have had no difficulty in obtaining the money for the limited pilot studies that proceed the formulation of a sophisticated research proposal. However, in the past two years we have had difficulty in obtaining this type of support. Consequently, we have had fewer people who were able to get an idea formulated in a researchable structure because they haven't had the money or the where-with-all it takes to get the thing started. Maybe this will be corrected.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

This was answered partially while talking about six. For emphasis, I would like to say again that in the area of research nothing can replace the faculty member who has the idea that can be developed in terms that will lead to the development of hypotheses and techniques for testing hypotheses. Money and other support are nothing if you don't have the faculty members with the ideas.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

The answer is poorly. We do have research that has been financed by the United States Office of Education. We have built into the grant, money for publication, but that is hardly disseminating. We encourage faculty members to duplicate and we have a little publication called _____ _____ that calls attention to things going on. More important than the view of dissemination is establishing an in-service pattern that will help people relate or adapt what we have found workable or better to their particular situation.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

If I could do as I would like, I would engage faculty members who are on fire with ideas that are researchable.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The teacher with ideas initiates the research. All I do as director is to provide the services necessary to help them define their hypotheses, to get the where-with-all and personnel to test their hypotheses, and to publish their results.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

Yes, they are given release time when they get the research in form to work with it. One of the problems we face is having faculty members who want time to find an idea that is researchable. My experience is, that people who have time to dream up ideas never do so. The faculty member who is involved in the give-and-take of a teacher and learner environment is the one who gets ideas about a better way to do whatever it is they need to do. These people are the ones who formulate research projects. This segment is not to be construed that after a faculty member has established his problems and hypotheses that he does not need time to verify his hypotheses. He does

need time to do that. He also needs time to put together the instruments that he is going to use, whatever they may be.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

You cannot be a full-time teacher and do research, but you can be a full-time teacher while you are creating ideas that can be stated as researchable problems.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

We make known to any applicant for a position in the laboratory school that they are expected to seek new ways for helping in the learning process. Our major emphasis here is on learning, not on teaching, so that we think you should be able to innovate, create, or establish new environments for children, always searching for that environment that is most conducive to the style of the individual child or small groups of children. However, we recognize that a faculty cannot be all "chiefs" or all "Indians." If everyone on our faculty wanted to conduct a sophisticated piece of research, we would not have the time nor money for them to do so.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research functions of laboratory schools as unique?

No.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

Those that are most appropriate for a laboratory school would have to deal with the teacher-learner environments. I see no limitations to that.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

Research is financed in this school first by the university. We have to justify release time for a faculty member to carry out a study. We are constantly trying to

get our limited university funds supplemented by some foundation or grant. Sometimes we have success, but more often we do not.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

It may be that I have over-extended myself in the other responses, but I would add that one of the major kinds of activities in our laboratory school is concerned with finding more effective ways to organize the learning environment for the child. We are not placing emphasis on sophisticated research that would receive national acclaim; rather on how do you identify the child in such a way that you can define his learning style, and describe an environment that would be conducive to a person having that learning style.

Institution "D"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

Our community of _____ _____ is centrally located in the state of _____. The population is around 60,000. The main industries are education, medical services, and insurance. There are three colleges with student population totaling about 26,000. Students apply to the laboratory school and they are selected according to the space available. We try to maintain a balance of boys to girls, and we try to maintain a cross-section of our community. About 34 percent of our students come from people who are university staff. About 33 percent come from professional people, lawyers, doctors, dentists. The other 33 percent are made up of business men, farmers, laborers. In our particular community about 7 percent of the population is black, and in the school we maintain 7 percent blacks.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

I am not sure of this. As director, this is my second year. I worked as a supervisor in the laboratory school prior to that, and there has been some research since I have been here. Previous emphasis had been in the student teaching program and teacher training. There had been so many students, however, that it would have been impossible for the laboratory school to handle all of them in student teaching, so they were placed in the public schools and emphasis began to change.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

Yes, we do have a brief statement. One of the primary responsibilities of the laboratory school is the furthering of knowledge through active participation in basic research. Some of this should be initiated by the faculty of the laboratory school and the college of education. Other studies would be originated in other

departments of the university. In order that there would be an orderly approach to research without disrupting other functions of the laboratory school, it is essential that certain guidelines be established. For this purpose, the following guidelines are established:

A. All requests to conduct research should be cleared through the office of the director of the laboratory school. This should be by written request of the chairman of the department.

B. A written proposal should be submitted with the request.

C. All proposed studies will be conducted on the following bases:

1. How will it affect the educational program of the children in the laboratory school?

2. How will this affect our space utilization or interfere with other educational programs?

3. Is it humane? What effects might it have on the students involved?

4. Can it be a learning experience for the pupils?

5. Is it in harmony with the educational principles and philosophies of the school?

6. How many other programs are already going on? How many disruptions is each child being subjected to?

7. The time required for completion of the study.

D. Studies from the college of education will have priority in case of time conflicts. Otherwise, the first one submitted will be given priority over later requests.

E. Studies will not be permitted during the beginning and closing of the school session.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

This is difficult to do because of the floating nature of priorities at this time, not only in the laboratory school but at the university as we go through a period of reassessment and readjustment in our priorities. We think at the laboratory school that quality education for all students is first; second, a service function to the college of education in the form of observation, and service experience. Third, teacher training; fourth, research; and fifth, service to other schools within the community, who come through visitation, or staff members who go out for workshops in the surrounding area.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

Yes, I think we have done a better job with it than the ranking which I have given it at this time. I have just been looking through; and we have about 65 different pieces of research which have been done within the last five years.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

I feel that we have a good working relationship with the college of education personnel and with the personnel within the other departments of the university, particularly within the area of psychology. We have had several pieces of research initiated from that area.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

There are several things which seem to have impeded it. The small number of students which we have seems to be inadequate for some types of research. We do not have release time for our personnel to engage in research. We do not have the funds to finance projects that were of interest to our own staff.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

As I have mentioned, much of the research that is

being done here comes from outside people rather than from the laboratory school staff. Much of this is in the realm of pilot studies by graduate students who are working on their doctorate. They will do the pilot study using our facility, our students, and then they go out into another school or other areas to complete their study. The dissemination then would come when they publish their dissertation and articles from it. We did not have adequate records here of how this has been disseminated. Some is disseminated through monograph which we have made, but this has been limited.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

I do want to increase our facilities, have some space available for housing experimental groups, small groups, and individuals, where we could control the conditions and make them a little more nearly ideal. I would want additional staff available to permit some release time for research work. I also would like to have some additional funds for conducting research and for the dissemination of results.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

Most of it at this time is initiated from other departments. We have had several done from psychology, some from physical education, and some from our own staff.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

No, they are not.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

My personal feeling is that it seems to be an unreasonable load, at least in our situation. We have observers in all classrooms. The supervisor is required to supervise students and observers as they come through. Researchers really need time to think and contemplate.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

Up to this point, our teaching and supervisory ability has been the primary concern. We are going through a re-planning stage and may change in the next few years.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

We have had great freedom to change our program and we have had greater control over the factors surrounding them than you might have in another situation. I think the sense of control and being able to alter plans and do things gives us a unique freedom that you can't find in a public school or other areas.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

I feel that studies relating to the learning process, the organizational plans, to learning theory and to social interaction or relationships can be handled very well in the laboratory school setting.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

It is taken from the normal operating funds. Up to this time, there has not been special support given for its function.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

(No response.)

Institution "E"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

   The community in which this laboratory school resides is a medium size town of about 38,000. The university itself has an enrollment as a rule of about 11,000-12,000 students. On a chronological order, people are admitted with preference to faculty and staff.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

   Research has been a function of this laboratory school from its beginning four years ago.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

   The policy statement for research as such is not printed. However, it is a part of the total function expressed for the school at all levels of undergraduate and graduate programs. Also, research is coordinated for the school and for the higher education people served through the coordination of instruction.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

   Due to the multi-service nature of this laboratory school, the answer to this question is contingent upon the area involved. We serve four departments mainly: guidance and counselor education, elementary education, physical education, and psychology. No doubt each of these departments may have different ideas as to our chief function in terms of our respective specifications. However, generally, our main function is described as acclimating future professionals to work with students at our readiness levels with emphasis on self-direction, continuous learning, and the blending of theory and practical sequentials. Following this primary general function by specific areas, our function is to provide

representative experiences from the whole spectrum: first for elementary education; second for physical education; third, guidance and counselor education; and fourth, psychology. However, we do serve many other departments and/or colleges including music, speech and theater, and nursing. In terms of our total service, our function may be summarized in order of thrust as laboratory experiences for campus groups, higher education in the main, and demonstration and dissemination for off-campus groups or in-service.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

   Yes.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

   A. Having a coordinator of curriculum who also serves as a coordinator of research with the on-going curriculum at the higher education level and at the laboratory school level.

   B. Cooperating in research relevant to the immediate population served. This is a real facilitating factor.

   C. Avoiding research which could be duplicative or performed more feasibly by another agency such as Title III.

   D. An effort to articulate research within the prospective of the elementary program and with higher education programs so as to bring supportive self-direction, controlled learning, and the blending of theory and practice in the elementary curriculum.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

   A. The lack of time or prevailing breadth and depth of commitment.

   B. University philosophy which includes that in the

total academic context of needs and resources to the laboratory experiences justify a high priority than doing more extensive research.

C. The single class sections from early childhood centers through center six.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

The research performed is disseminated through the researcher and through the placing of copies with the coordinator of research and curriculum so that it may be shared with others of kindred interest.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

If we had the opportunity, we would want implementation of such changes as would permit time and other provisions for laboratory school faculty to do more formal research pertinent to their curriculum development.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The research conducted in this laboratory school is derived from two main sources: higher education students and faculty and the laboratory school faculty.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

No, unfortunately, the laboratory faculty members who engage in research are not given release time.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

It is my belief that it is not practical for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and to do research, especially with involvement of the laboratory experiences with higher education in the many other areas of demonstration and dissemination.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

In view of the total competencies, that is, the potential employee's research expertise and disposition to do it, would comprise from 25-30 percent of the total concerned.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

Yes, because of its live, viable and dynamic nature with (a) prototype environment for implementation, (b) because of the realistic blending of theory and practice which is not characteristic of pure research, (c) the committed personal and professional motivation of the researcher.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program

Research which would focus on better understanding of the development and needs of the learner; and research which would best identify and support the formulation of optimum learning environments commensurate with identified learner needs. It should be remembered that the process of this research should be content for current laboratory school personnel in higher education levels who may be observing this on-going research.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

It is the responsibility of the researcher in terms of grants, special assignments, departmental and personal support.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

It seems that it is significant to the continued well-being of the laboratory school that in their research there be a balance of service output for the local and academic communities, with the greater weight being in favor of the local community. This distribution is a function of votes and appropriations, very realistically.

Institution "F"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

   We are in the center of the city of _____. Children from the city and from outside of the city apply for admission to the school. They supply a Stanford-Binet test study along with comments from a psychologist on their social and emotional development. Then they visit the school for two days, sitting in with children of their own age. In this way, the faculty attempts to ascertain that they are reasonably healthy, well-adjusted kids. Then, a faculty committee studies all applications and decisions are made to admit children according to the needs of different classes. Classes are structured in such a way as to have approximately the same number of boys as girls, have a good racial mix, and have as wide a range as possible of intellectual capability. We attempt to have a very heterogeneous population. We also try to make sure that at least two-thirds of the children come from families that are not directly related to the university.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

   Research has been a function of this school for approximately ten years.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

   We do not have an official policy statement concerning research in the laboratory school. However, when they are admitted, parents of the children sign a statement stating that they recognize that the children will be used for experimental purposes. However, we make every effort to safeguard the welfare of the youngsters and not involve them in anything that will, in any way, be detrimental to their education.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

The functions of our laboratory school in order of importance are:

A. Demonstration of excellence in teaching children.

B. Involvement of university students in teacher education experiences and other types of student experience, such as training of psychiatry residents.

C. Experimentation and research.

Of course, there are a number of less inclusive functions, but these probably are the major items.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

We have not conducted as much research as I would like to; but we certainly have been busy overworking our limited personnel with our research activities.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The factors and conditions most helpful to successful research have been the opportunity to employ graduate assistants from time to time and the determination on the part of a few of us to see that research progressed. This year we have a foundation grant which will continue for another year. This is particularly helpful.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

Factors that have hindered productive research are primarily extremely heavy faculty load. In addition to operating a regular school program we have the matter of developing a new curriculum for every field in order to operate a non-graded school. Most of us carry university teaching loads as well as doing the laboratory school work. Also, the massive amount of "red tape" in operating as a private university has hindered our progress.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Results of research in the laboratory school are not disseminated well enough. This is done largely through mimeographed materials distributed at professional meetings and to university classes. We need to do more with journal publications, but time problems make this difficult.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

If given the opportunity, I certainly would increase the personnel to carry out the research activities. At present we have only one classroom teacher who is released one-third time for research, but I would like to see this opportunity given much more often to the excellent demonstration teachers.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The research projects are most often initiated by the director of the school; but outside projects are encouraged and the assistant director coordinates these activities.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

As mentioned previously, only one of our faculty members has had release time for research activity; but we do employ two or three graduate assistants for research, and under our Millen grant we have a research coordinator who works two-thirds time as well as a couple of extra graduate assistants.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

If a full-time teacher in the laboratory school does not have much involvement with university students, he or she may do a small amount of continuing research. However, it must be done on quite a limited basis.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

We consider the interests of potential faculty members in experimentation and research, but we do not expect them to have the capability in this area.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

Probably our newer research projects on diagnostic process assessment for use in nongraded classrooms is quite unique. Another fairly unique aspect might be that we do have a small office especially for research functions in our laboratory school building.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

Many types of research related to how children learn and how to assess their progress in learning are appropriate in the laboratory school program. Various types of pilot studies are appropriate also, but they should, of course, be replicated in a public school setting after the difficulties have been worked out of them.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

Again, the research in this school is financed by including graduate assistants in the budget, by arranging occasionally for a foundation grant, and computer time supplied through an allotment to the school of education from the university's computer center.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

Many laboratory schools have "fallen by the wayside," partly because they have not carried on significant research. However, budget planning must be realistic if such research is to be carried on.

Institution "G"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

   The two communities of _____ and _____ have about 70,000 population. In _____ we have the national office for _____ _____ _____; we have the state office for the _____ Agriculture Association, and there are a number of professional people in the community.

   We have an increasingly specific way of selecting students for our laboratory schools. In general our guidelines call for selection of the student population as near the normal curve of academic ability as possible. We try to keep the sexes about equal and we try to get as many kinds of socio-economic groups as we can within the normal curve. The scores come in, and in some cases we give the tests ourselves. We convert these to stanines, then with the use of these stanines we try to select people who will give us a normal distribution so that whatever we find in our research is more widely applicable.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

   Research has been one of the functions of this laboratory school for as long as I have been here and for probably 50 years or so before. It has become much more important recently since we have adopted new guidelines and functions.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

   (No response.)

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

The three functions of the laboratory school are first of all research and development projects in teaching and learning because we are a teacher training institution. That's our major thing. In addition to that, the retraining of public school teachers who may come in and work with us for three to four years, and also the demonstration of outstanding teaching. In the research itself, we are trying to emphasize a little more of the longitudinal research than we did before, and as a result we are in the process of building a data bank that the student may enter at the lower end of the _____ School and have his records carried on computer tape all the way up to high school. Then we can look back and see some of the developmental changes that have happened.

It is quite clear that there is a definite rank for the functions of laboratory schools. Bonafide research is first; second would be the developmental nature in which we have data but they would not be called research in the classical sense; third would be the demonstration of quality teaching. We make a number of tapes which can be used in classes, university classes, and we also have a lot of visitors in to see programs that are currently functioning. Last of all then would be the training and retraining of public school teachers who have already been out in positions, but who wish to come back to work in some of our new programs or with some of our new methods.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

Up until I came on the job about a year ago, another of the priorities of the laboratory school was the possibility of junior participation, pre-student teaching participation, and this took up so much of the time that we were not able to give the time to research that we now are. Those either have been or are being completely phased out and we will be able to focus more on research.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The factors that have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school are many. One, of course, is

that our major focus, except for a two year interim, has been teacher education; and therefore, most of the departments were interested in research or in pilot studies in this area. In addition, the staff of the laboratory school has always been excellent and has had a number of research qualifications and has initiated a number of these themselves. We have always had excellent support from the administration, both from the standpoint of funds and to making the necessary arrangements in the laboratory school to facilitate research.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

Up until our new president came to the campus, laboratory schools were so over-burdened with live demonstrations and pre-student teaching participation experiences that we really didn't have the time to do the productive research in which we are now engaged. As I said before, that has all been taken care of now so that we can clear the decks for the functions indicated above.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Up until I came the dissemination of our research results was kind of haphazard. If the teachers had time to write things up for a journal, we often got things published in journals. There were some mimeographed things that were distributed and of course lists were kept about reports in each of the schools. At the present time I have innovated what we call the _____ _____ Journal, and we put this out three or four times a year. We have research reports and/or descriptions of unique methods written either by people who are doing research in the laboratory school or by the staff in the laboratory school. We have sent these out to all the elementary and secondary school principals in a wide area in addition to some of the schools of education. Thus far we think it is quite successful. In addition, we have some Education Service monographs of some of the larger developmental and experimental studies that have been done in the laboratory schools. While we don't print as many of these and while they go to a more selected audience, this is another way in which they are disseminated.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

At the present time, I would not make any changes in the factors and conditions and arrangements that we have in the laboratory school. We really have constructed the ones that we have and we feel that they are operating quite well, but we need to have more experience with them before we know if they are successful, but I think that if things go in the direction in which they are pointed now, we will become more and more research laboratory schools and it will become evident to all who read the research reports that we have a much stronger research facility than we had before.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

Almost everyone can initiate research conducted in the laboratory school. Right now the emphasis is on the departments of the university, and they are now working on cooperative planning committees with some of the laboratory school people. In addition the scholars of each department have used the laboratory schools for many years for their own investigations. The people in the laboratory schools themselves can initiate research and several of them have research going on. Also, graduate students at the masters and doctoral levels may use the laboratory school for pilot studies and for more basic studies in teaching and learning. So, almost anyone can initiate research conducted in the laboratory school.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

Laboratory school faculty members who are engaged in research may have release time in a number of ways. Of course they can buy their own time from their grant money; also the university has grant money which we may use at times; the University Research Committee grants a certain number of positions to the laboratory school in which we pay part time, at least, for work that laboratory school teachers may be doing in research. In our new staffing

arrangements, we have some people who are known as area coordinators who hold rank in other departments and have about half-time teaching loads in the laboratory schools. For the other half of this teaching assignment they are expected to supervise the more temporary staff and also facilitate the other R & D projects that may be going on.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I think this is commendable but I certainly would not suggest it as a practice for people teaching in the laboratory school.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

While many of our area coordinators will be able to conduct research, our temporary staff, those who man most of the classrooms, do not have the capability of conducti research. Really what we are after here is excellent and flexible teaching so that whatever project we are on these people can accommodate their methods to do the sorts of things that we are asking for in the particular research. We do have a lot of research capabilities in our departments and there is a good deal of consulting that goes on, and many times the people who propose the research are experts or have experts on their staff. Things are well designed.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

One of the things about our laboratory school setup that is unique, as far as I know at least, is that it is possible for a student to go from pre-kindergarten through high school in one of our laboratory schools; therefore, we have an excellent chance to do developmental studies and to keep records all along the way. I think this would be a rather unique situation in the country.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

Since our major focus is on teacher training, certainly teaching and learning studies are the most appropriate for laboratory schools. This would include

curriculum innovations in addition to studies on how best we can train teachers and how best children learn.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

Laboratory school-connected research is financed in several ways. Many projects are financed by grants from the outside. A number are financed by grants from the university, and a number are done by people who are willing to spend the extra time, and the extra money, to make use of the laboratory school facilities.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

One of the things that I think is unique about the way we have been set up here at _____ State is, since we have money for certain positions, we are in a position to offer some benefits to departments in order to involve them in the ongoing research and development projects that are in the laboratory schools. Often a department head might have a person he would like to employ for one or two courses, but is unable to or the money isn't available. If he is also someone we could employ in the laboratory schools, we could help him in this way. Also qualified graduate students may be hired to teach either full time or part time in the laboratory schools. This helps the department to recruit excellent people for their programs. In this kind of setting, the laboratory school has some incentive as leverage to continue to interest the departments in doing research and development in the laboratory schools.

Institution "H"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

   Students who apply to our campus school are selected by a lottery system. The quota is approximately 20 in each age or grade level. It varies according to style of open education or lack of style.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

   Research has been a function of the campus school since 1940, at which time there was a Board of Research Study in the foreign language program.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

   The official policy concerning research is attached. Briefly it attempts to protect the child as a subject of research. It also attempts to make possible a correct design before it is implemented.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

   The functions of our laboratory school have been changing rapidly in the past ten years. Under present terms we are negotiating with the school district, the state university headquarters, and state education department headquarters, to have the laboratory school financed in part by public funds and through agreement with the public schools. Those expenses above that level at which a child in a public school would be financed, would be paid by the state university. The functions change considerably, and we will now be entering into five years of focusing on being an assessment center, a demonstration center of innovative practices, a research center, a try-out of new programs and new structures, a competency-based center, and other such functions. Service function to the region and to the state will also receive high priority.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

In terms of the laboratory school conducting research, it is slowly being de-emphasized as the other functions are absorbing more and more of our time as the staff and as auxiliary personnel.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The conditions that have facilitated productive research in the campus school are the proximity of four colleges. We have a consortium of four colleges which makes it easy for any of the colleges to show an interest in research. Because of the ease in sharing, people do come to me and ask, "May we conduct this particular kind of research?" Our answer is always yes, if feasible.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

The factors that have hindered productive research is that our present research person has much less than 50 percent of his time scheduled for research. He does not have a sub-staff. Those 30 instructors on our staff have a number of functions to serve. Literally we have over 30,000 visitors a year as well as neighboring systems who wish to see certain programs of instruction implemented. Being all things to all people has meant that research has to be just one of the functions.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Results of the research that we have listed have been published in psychological journals primarily.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

In terms of what could be done to improve research in the laboratory school, the answer lies primarily in

funding and staffing. A research person should be assigned full-time to research, should have secretarial help, and should have an assistant to do the light work in many of the things we could be researching.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

You asked who initiates the research. I think I have referred to that in terms of the number of college associates in the consortium initiating and coming to us with their proposal. Our own staff has initiated some, as you note from the names _____, _____, _____, and _____ who are laboratory school personnel.

11. Are laboratory school faculty members engaged in research given relase time or other compensation for such research activity?

The only release time that our faculty has who engage in research activity is _____, who has several functions. One function is school psychologist, one research, one teacher of college courses related to disabilities. No other person on the staff has release time or compensatory time which is one of the deterrants to ongoing research.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I don't believe that a full-time laboratory school teacher can do much in the way of feeding information into research. The research team of an assistant, and one or more secretaries could do most of the "leg work." Then the research could be designed by the full-time teacher.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

In our interviews we stress more the abilities to read, use and implement research rather than the ability to design research.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research functions of laboratory schools as unique?

This is very difficult to answer because it is such

a global question. In our particular case, yes, it is unique because of the consortium of the four colleges. We provide the unique subject for the particular studies which they have.

15. What particular types of research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

Primarily the action research type is most appropriate. However, other research, again I repeat, can well be handled and many important things need testing by a research team.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

Laboratory school connected research in our school is not financed. It is an incorporated part of the school psychologist's regular assignment and the teachers' regular assignments.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research functions of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

I see a great deal of benefit that could be derived from more research in the campus schools. In their research they should try many new things and help implement these programs in area schools.

Institution "I"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

The student population of our laboratory school has been around 550 students. Of this total there are 45 to 50 special education students which come from five surrounding school districts. The students who enroll at the laboratory school are selected on a first-come, first-serve basis, all things being equal. We have made selections of students with varied social, cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds that gives a balance comparable to that of our community and part of the state. This balance still suggests a minority group of non-white children.

_____ is primarily a rural community of about 20,000 people, with the university comprising 15,000 students and faculty. So you see, there's quite a balance between these two factions. It provides some interesting challenges in the battle between "town and gown." We have been very fortunate in the last few years as things have been rather settled, when on other campuses there was considerable turmoil.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

There have been research activities for many years. However, it has been secondary to promoting the demonstration and observation of the teacher education program. During the deliberations with the higher Board of Education in the last two years, they indicated that they felt that the laboratory school in _____ should have research as a primary responsibility.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

We do not have an official policy statement concerning research in the laboratory school. The staff has been encouraged to do research in a half-hearted way because

we have not been able to release them of their other responsibilities to the degree that would allow them to do meaningful research activity.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

In ranking the functions of our laboratory school, I would have to say that experimentation, participation, and observation have been the primary functions, with research playing a secondary role. In the last couple of years there has been increased emphasis on research. However, this has paralleled the staffing cut-back and resources have not been available, both financial and personnel wise, in order for us to move in this particular direction.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

(No response.)

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

Relating to questions six and seven, I think they can probably be answered together. I feel we have had more hindrances than we have had helps in getting our research activities off the ground. We have several faculty members who have a high interest in research, but it has been necessary to give them heavy teaching loads which certainly hasn't encouraged them to develop research activities. The laboratory school has been a two unit school, and if they decided to develop experimental and control groups, it was possible to do this in the laboratory school. By going into the public schools they could add another dimension and come up with a broad and representative set of subjects for most research activities.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

(Answered above.)

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

There has been no organized procedure for disseminating the results of the research activities that have been carried on.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

I think one of the important things would be to alter or change the staff because most of the faculty were hired as excellent teachers with research as a secondary function. Another important consideration would be having sufficient financial resources in order to support the research activities. There are limited funds on campus. However, the competition for them is so keen and the amount is so limited that any research activities which these funds would support if attained would not allow a faculty member to develop a research activity of an extensive nature.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

Most research is initiated by the faculty member himself with support from the administration.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

On rare occasions we are able to release faculty members to do some type of research activity. However, this has been very minimal, as has been the compensation, unless they were fortunate enough to use the results in some type of meaningful experience in which they could engage in in-service training in area schools where they would act as consultant in realizing directly the benefits of this experiment or research activity.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I do not think it practical for a laboratory faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research. He

may be able to do some pilot activities, but sophisticated research of the type that is needed today would be very difficult to carry on in overload responsibility. I think this is one of the problems that we have in education today; that the research that needs to be done to deal with some of the most subjective aspects is not something that can be accomplished as an extra responsibility.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

I could not say that a faculty member's qualifications would necessitate great experience in research. As we have attempted in the past few years to give more emphasis to research, the financial cutbacks that we have had have not permitted us to hire a person who is recognized in this field. As a result, we have not been able to give the impetus to this that we would like or that we feel is necessary for us to become recognized as a research-oriented school.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

There are certain advantages a laboratory school would offer a researcher, namely, that of having a student population for experimentation and research. In our particular school I feel that we have considerable freedom to experiment and research our kids. We can field test a lot of things which would not be possible in the public schools in utilizing the staff and student population of the school, develop instruments or techniques that could be utilized on a broader population once the "bugs" are worked out. I think this is one of the unique functions that a laboratory school can carry on.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

(No response.)

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

There is no organized procedure to follow. The university does make limited monies available for

research activities that are competed for by all members of the faculty on a university-wide basis. Unfortunately the demands are great and the supply is small.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

I feel that laboratory schools could be meaningful research centers if the local institutions, state and governmental agencies, would see fit to finance them and support them as they have attempted to do in some of the federal-regional centers. Where, but on a college campus, could you find such human resources. That is characteristic of most of our institutions. Putting these all together and properly utilizing them would provide an opportunity to accomplish some of the most meaningful research needed in education today--the type of research that is more than a factual or statistical study. Some of the controversial writers of our day indicate that in education we have not really researched the more important things, those things that deal with the affective domain and those that deal with the attitudes and feelings of people, and deal with the less invisible needs of concerns of children. Such activities, in order to research and analyze, demand great resources, both financial and human. We have not been able to bring to bear sufficient interest to support these kinds of activities in a manner that would allow the research to be accomplished so that results would cast significant "ripples upon the waters."

Institution "J"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

The community of _____ is a town of approximately 30,000, plus an adjoining community of _____ _____ which represents another 8,000, and some small outlying areas. The students who come to this school are students of Independent District _____. In addition to those students from District _____, we do accept court referrals, Social service referrals, crippled children, and so on, that are eligible to attend from other districts on a contract basis. Students who come to _____ _____ School do so by choice. It represents one of the alternatives in the local school district. Our criteria for selection is based in rank order on: _____ _____ School staff children, additional children from families of children already enrolled at _____, children whose age or grade fits the vacancies which exist, a cross-section of the student population of school district _____, referrals by social service, district _____ schools, mental health centers, etc., special education and handicapped cases. A last criterion is children residing in the neighborhood area in which _____ _____ School is located.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

Research has been a stated function of this laboratory school since 1968 in an attempt to become an innovative laboratory school.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

We do not have an official policy statement regarding research, although in realistic terms, research has been a stated function here. The School of Education and the campus school always seem to have higher priorities and have difficulty in funding or staffing an ongoing research program. We have attempted several

times to operate a research program as an integral part of the college research office. Unfortunately there have been so many pressures on that college research office that they have been unable to devote sufficient time to the campus school program. We have in effect always been last on the list. This year I have attempted to take on the research job as part of my other duties, and my primary effort has been bringing things up to date. I have several proposals for the future and I am trying to get some sort of graduate assistant in order to put in a better effort on the research.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

We have basically four functions: (1) to serve the students in an innovative fashion and demonstrate the viability of an innovative open alternative education; (2) pre-service work with future teachers; namely, undergraduate and graduate students at _____ _____ and at other institutions of higher education; (3) in-service work with educators in the immediate area, the state, and the country. To do this we operate an ongoing progra of visitation, consultant work, and workshops. We presently work with over 2,000 educators per year, so this is a primary function. Our fourth function is the research function.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

We are not in keeping with the rank that we have indicated. We have not committed sufficient staff or funds to doing research.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

In terms of what research we have done, the factors and conditions which seem to have asisted this are master of science programs in the curriculum and instruction in which we employ certified teachers in a one year program which leads to a masters degree. In part of that program we require the writing of an alternate plan program or a master's thesis. This program has also been extended to the specialist level. So, much of our research thus far has been done by graduate students.

However, this has not been well-disseminated information and I have attempted to write abstracts, pull this material together and make it available for distribution to interested educators. We do attempt some in-house research.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

Some factors or conditions which hinder research at the laboratory school are the present problem of enrollment at the college, the emphasis on generating credit hours to maintain staff which has tied up our own staff as well as the college research office, plus the fact that we have attempted to expand our programs rapidly and do so without additional staff. These have all hindered our research. Secondly, our rapid change has made it very difficult to do heavily controlled research.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

The results of our research have been disseminated primarily by mail upon request or handed to individual visitors, educators when they are on campus or on the premises.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

In regard to changes we would like to make in the future, primarily we would like to have some funds available for dissemination of information and communication with other institutions in working with similar problems. We would like to have a graduate assistant to do some of the routine work in pulling together these studies.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

At the moment most research is being initiated either by graduate students or by myself.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research

given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

In terms of faculty members engaged in research, I have two grants on which I am presently working. One of the studies is follow-up on student teachers and their success in gaining employment, and one is a study of what has happened to our students who graduate from the laboratory school.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

As I indicated earlier, I don't think it is particularly practical for a laboratory school member to be a full-time teacher and to do research in this type of open experimental program. In a traditional program, I would say yes.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

In our criteria for employing faculty members, conducting research is a minimal or negligible consideration. We are more concerned with their flexibility in working with students, their ability to be creative and try new ideas. We recognize that many creative individuals can come up with many ideas for working with students but are not particularly good in research.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

I don't know of any research function that we are doing that is truly unique.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

The type of research that we feel is most appropriate is that which would demonstrate or illustrate the viability of our program and its possible utilization in a public school setting.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

The college and the laboratory school have not

funded research at all. The only funding we have this year are the two faculty research grants which I received.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

Here are comments on several miscellaneou aspects which might be valuable. We have not been par icularly successful in involving college staff members irom other departments in doing research within the campus school. I think you will find this true in many, many campuses. There is a definite division between the campus school and other departments. This is particularly true here since we run into the problem of when we encourage staff members to do research here, they change our program to do their research, rather than do research on our existing program. We were given a specific mandate by the legislature and by the local college board and by the college administration that we were to attempt highly innovative programs. This precluded varying our program just to enable other staff members to do research. However, I do not believe our laboratory school is unique in that respect.

Secondly, we will be using the annual report here as a method of evaluating and disseminating information. We plan to put together an annual report which we will be able to use in our in-service work with area educators. We are particularly weak in publications. We will attempt (actually I am already working on it) to put together some research reports to have available for dissemination.

We do need assistance or time at least for us to attempt to get more materials published in the regular publications. I am also making an attempt now to encourage outside educational organizations to come in and evaluate that portion of our program dealing with their subject area interests.

Institution "K"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

_____ has approximately 18,000 people, largely engaged in agriculture work and working in small plants and industries located in the immediate vicinity. The largest organization in the city of _____ is the university, which enrolls some 6750 students and employs 750-800 individuals working with the university. The per capita income is below average. Students for the campus school are selected in three levels of priority. The first level of priority is given to the children of faculty members of the university; second priority is to children who live within a seven square block of the campus school. This would include a large majority of the married students with children and a large area of reasonable middle class homes. The third level of priority for admission to the campus school is any other student in _____ County. Parents will provide transportation to the _____ Campus School.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

The _____ Campus School is in its twenty-fifth year of operation, that is, its twenty-fifth year of joint operation by the university and the _____ County Board of Education. If past records are reliable, research has been an integral part of this program for the past six or seven years.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

At the present time, there is no official policy with regard to research at the laboratory school. However, as a result of increased interest in the past two years on the part of faculty doing research in the school, also by virtue of this survey you are making, it is very probable that we will have a policy regarding research developed within the next year.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

A review of the records of the university indicates no clear cut statement with regard to the function of the laboratory school. Therefore, it is difficult to rank the importance of research in this facility. The primary function of this facility provides observation, para-professional and student teaching experiences at the elementary level. Also, the school is used for observation and participation by graduate students and college of education faculty members. It should be pointed out, that in the last two years there has been much interest generated in using this facility for research, though in terms of ranking, research would probably be last or at the bottom of the list.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

The laboratory school has conducted research probably in keeping with the rank indicated above; in other words, research has been at a very low level of priority within the school.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The factors and conditions or other considerations that seem to have facilitated productive research in the laboratory school are renewed interest on the part of the faculty in actually conducting research studies in the facility. Only in the last two to three years new faculty members have been brought to the university who have been interested in this endeavor. It is quite probable that in the very near future, this facility could be saturated with research.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

The major factors that have hindered research in this laboratory school have been lack of interest on the part of individuals associated with the school and the university in actually carrying out research. A second factor that has hindered productive research in

the facility is lack of observation space and the lack of general space to carry out the essential program of the school. It is hoped that sometime in the near future that expansion can be made to the existing facility or that a new school can be built. In the event that either one of these occurs, research activities will be increased.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

The results of the research in this laboratory school are disseminated primarily internally. Since there has been limited research activity underway in the past few years, national research has been limited to several journal articles and presentations of papers before national meetings. During the 1972-73 school year, a newsletter has been developed for the laboratory school which will be disseminated quite readily among faculty, parents, and other interested individuals. The first number of the first volume will be off the press within the next ten days, and a copy will be forwarded to you for your records.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

It would seem that the wisest plan would be for the development of long-range strategies for conducting research in the facility that would help improve the program, as well as provide research data for faculty members. If the principal and teachers within the facility were encouraged to instigate research on their own, better and more productive research might also come out of the laboratory school. As was pointed out earlier, there is a need for more space within the facility for conducting research studies and for observation.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The initiation of research in the laboratory school comes primarily from faculty members of the college of education. It will be noted in the enclosed material that the majority of the studies have been initiated by faculty members during the last two to three years.

Some studies have come as a result of a master's thesis and research problems carried out in the laboratory school. Several of these research studies, theses, and so forth were conducted by teachers who are employed in the laboratory facility, but were also working on advanced degrees in the college of education.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

Laboratory faculty members who are engaged in research are given release time or other compensation for this activity.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

It is my personal feeling that it is practical for laboratory school faculty members to be a full-time teacher and to do research. Every teacher can do some limited research in their own classrooms.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

There is no criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school that includes their capacity or ability to conduct research.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

At this time there are no unique aspects of research going on in the laboratory school.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

A variety of different types of educational research can be carried out within the laboratory school program. For example, different types of science programs, comparison of different types of social studies programs, studies that involve observation of children, development of experimental programs, movement education in the area of physical education, or similar types of action studies.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

The research work that has been done or is going on in the laboratory school has been financed primarily from college of education funds. No particular funds within the college of education are earmarked for research. However, it has been possible, even in the times of austere budgets, to take some limited money from materials and resources to use in conducting research. Largely, faculty time has been spent above and beyond class preparation time. Several faculty members within the past two years have had limited financial assistance from the faculty research fund of the university, which has defrayed the cost of purchase of test materials and administering tests.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

There are no additional comments related to the research function of the college of education to make. However, I would like to emphasize that as a result of your questionnaire, it has given us the opportunity to sit down and examine in depth exactly what has been going on in the area of research and what is needed.

Institution "L"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

We are physically situated in a white suburban _____ County. There is no tuition to attend the laboratory school. Although we have made some effort to cross-section our school so that while we have quite a few white, very verbal children that belong to professors on campus, we have made a great deal of effort to include in our population inter-city black children and children of other races and backgrounds. We have many children who are fairly poor and low socio-economic levels. This area surrounding the college has a small built-in black, low socio-economic slum area. There are some natural selection problems in that there are no busing systems to come to this school. Therefore, we only have children who have some way of getting transportation on their own. We have long waiting lists and it is done on a first-come, first-serve basis. There are no special accommodations made for faculty children. We are in the process of changing our policy about tuition based upon an edict from the state which says that we must show some money in order to stay alive. There is going to be a modest tuition next year which will be tailored to the individual needs of the family.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

It has been three years since the function of the laboratory school was turned into that of predominantly a research center. Prior to that it had had more of a model function and was a center where students in the college could get observation experiences. We still do that, but our primary function now is to serve as a center where researchers can feel free to come in with a minimum of "red tape."

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

The only official policy statement we have concerning research is from a philosophical orientation that our doors are closed to no one. The only prerequisite or requirement that we have is that they have to give us the design of their research, and submit it to a very small, informal board that will review the procedures and the design of their experiment or their study. We have a research committee that reviews every proposal that is submitted.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

Basically, (1) to be a center where researchers can come; (2) to provide observation experiences for college students; (3) to try to offer public relations services in any way to the public schools in the community.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

I feel that the laboratory school has conducted research within the ranking we indicated in number four above. As you look through all the past issues of _____, which I am sending you, you will see we started off with a very modest beginning. Our _____ has become increasingly sophisticated, better in design and control so that we feel very proud of our latest issue.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The commitment of the dean and of the education department providing an open door policy. I would say that probably the cooperation of teachers, staff at the laboratory school, and the research director has helped facilitate research by others.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

We are not doing research ourselves. We are very dependent on outsiders. The reason for this is that our staff here are not trained researchers, they are just teachers. They view their responsibility as

serving as teachers and not as researchers. We are trying to ask some questions and to conduct some research ourselves apart from our outside researchers who come in, but that requires a lot of time and we don't really have the money.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

The results of the research are disseminated through our laboratory school publication, _____. It is published two times a year.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

I think that I would allow just a little more money so that we could have a staff of two or three people who really have some ideas of research.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

Predominantly, outside researchers. Another group are graduate or undergraduate students who have a course in research design and they have been asked to conduct a small experiment. Then there is another group of outside researchers, who wish to publish and are interested in obtaining a child population in order to publish their work.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

(No response.)

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

I don't think it is practical for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and to conduct research. We can and do have teachers here who are cooperative in every way, but we don't put the burden of research on them. We have tried to excite some of them to help me collect data, but they need a lot of guidance because they are not researchers.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability to conduct research?

I think it is important to have faculty members who teach children to also have the capability for conducting research. We don't really pay our teachers well enough that we should expect that they are going to be knowledgeable in research.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

I really can't think of any functions of our laboratory school that are unique.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

I think that the educational research that deals with largely the young children, questions on studies of creativity, studies on behavior modification techniques; these are appropriate for a laboratory school program. We don't really have enough pupils to have one control class, for example, versus an experimental class. Huge projects are really too much for us to handle since we have such a small population.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

We have a budget which allows us to function as a school and a small budget which pays for the printing of our laboratory school publication. The salary of the research director is provided.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

I feel that it is very important that laboratory schools remain alive, whether they are a research function or whether they serve as a model school; because I think it has been proven that public schools have their own vested interests, naturally, to protect their children and to protect their public image, so it is very hard for them to remain flexible enough to allow individual

researchers to come in without a great deal of hassle. Educators and psychologists need to have places where they can try out new ideas and do some investigations. It is really the philosophy upon which all higher education is predicated; and if we don't have some center where new ideas, as unorthodox as they may be, some place that allows for new or very different ways of looking at things and trying things out, eventually there would be no new ideas.

Institution "M"

1. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

The community is an isolated community of about 25,000 on the shores of _____ _____. Primarily rural based, it is pretty much blue collar and has in it a small university. The people who settle here are mainly French-Canadian and Catholic and I would say the community is somewhat conservative in its political thought and its value base.

Children are not selected for admission to the laboratory school. Anyone may apply. If we have more applying at a grade level than we can take care of, then by university law we must have a lottery. The lotteries in the past three years have only been held in the nursery school and in the kindergarten. The other classrooms are functioning between 18 to 23 students, and we have not had to hold a lottery in any of those classrooms.

2. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

Prior to 1969, whatever research was done in this particular campus school was of a minor nature carried on by individual teachers to the best of their ability without the assistance of any research staff. From 1969 to 1972 a researcher was a member of the staff to help teachers carry out research, to help in developing longer ranges and broader kinds of research. Therefore, that three year period was the only period to our knowledge that significant or major research was a function of this school. At the present time there is very little research going on in our school. More in keeping with what was happening prior to 1969, there is no research director or coordinator on the staff.

3. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

I have enclosed the guidelines for conducting research. It is in essence saying that no research can take place until it has been approved by the research director and the principal on the staff. Even then staff members can do research only in their field. When it affects other staff members or children in the school this also will have to be approved. It is an attempt to keep people from coming in to do research that is not relevant to our program or which might interfere with our program.

One facet of that research matter is this: if a person comes in with a research project, that research in its present form might not be appropriate for interaction with our staff. There may be some aspects of it that might be developed, and by involving our staff, their research ideas are shared with ideas of researchers from outside, adding to the significance for us at least.

4. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

At the time the first set of priorities were established a year ago, the following functions were identified:

(1) Experimenting with teaching and learning;

(2) Service to teacher education programs through short-term participation by college students and student teaching in our involvement in the development of the teacher education programs;

(3) Service to education in the arts and science program for their research purposes;

(4) Service to local schools and their staffs;

(5) Design and conduct research;

(6) Evaluation of ERDC programs.

During that study and the report that followed a year ago, we evaluated our priorities. At the present time we are working under the following five:

(1) Providing for a wide range of children both group and individual learning experiences to enhance the physical, cognitive, emotional, and inter-personal growth of the child;

(2) Design and conduct research related to the ERDC program and new elementary education proposal;

(3) Service to teacher education programs. Under that full semester, active student participation, what is meant by that is that the students would participate in a full semester, not just two or three or four weeks. Also under that, active participation of the ERDC staff in the development and implementation of teacher education programs. Also, in-service activities to involve public school teachers in a new education program as members of the professional team;

(4) The education arts and sciences programs for their research purposes;

(5) Service to local schools and their staffs.

If you will note the largest change in our priorities was that the evaluation of the ERDC program jumped from number six to the second place.

5. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 4 above?

I think it has become obvious as you have listened to this tape that we have not been able to do the research that was indicated in our priorities, primarily because we do not have a researcher on the staff at the present time. We still feel, however, that the research and evaluation program is of great importance.

6. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

The first extremely significant factor was the director in 1969-70, who in 1968-69 had prepared guidelines for research in his proposal to concern the role of the center. His stimulus was the first item of major significance. A young, innovative experimental staff and researcher who are actively teamed together to test some of their hypotheses about open education and humanistic processes. The enthusiasm of a new and growing program was also a major factor.

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

A teaching staff and a psychologist who had some difficulty in communication partly brought about by the researcher who had a classic conception of research and had had classic training in research design, which made it difficult to hear the kinds of "I-wonder-if's" the teachers had and translating those into research.

What the psychologist-researcher found was that they had to get themselves immersed into the process before they could translate what the educator was saying into a feasible piece of research for them. Teachers tend to be either too general or too idealistic and in our situation this was certainly true in that it took about a year and a half before our researcher was able to begin to hear what the teacher or teaching staff was saying about humanistic education.

The other side of the coin also is that teachers in the process of developing new programs took some time learning how to say it as clearly as they might. The increased clarity with which they understood their own procedures after a couple of years helped the researcher to gain further understanding.

8. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

Much of the research that has been done has been "inhouse" and has not been widely disseminated. You received during the summer time a synopsis of our self-evaluation and year-end report of research going on in our school. This to my knowledge has been the only general dissemination of any research here. In terms of minor federal and minor state grants there has been some dissemination only insofar as those organizations disseminated the information.

9. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

Earlier we made reference to needing a researcher or researchers who could hear teachers and write educational

research based on the kinds of "I-wonder-if's" that the teachers have. It really needs to be a researcher who understands open education and has a sense of the basic educational process. In addition, we need, I think, in a setting such as ours, data gatherers--quite a few data gatherers who can follow youngsters from one place to another as youngsters move very freely in our setting, to gather data as to where these youngsters go and what they do in these various settings. We need to know more about youngsters in order to gather accurate data. We also need somehow to keep a student body with us long enough so that we can do longitudinal studies.

As I see it at the present time, in order to have research done in a school you must have people trained in research and full time researchers working with teachers as teachers work with children. I do not see that teachers can be expected to do the research. I think this has been spelled out somewhat by Dr. Goodlad in the past five or six years. I often think that the laboratory schools in the United States are expected to do much more in this area than they are equipped to do.

10. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

The research in the past three years has been initiated primarily by discussions among teachers trying to search out and trying to seek out what results the new program is having on children.

11. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

In our setting they are not given release time or other compensation for research activities. We really don't see it as their major function. We think we should be supplying the support staff to do those kinds of things.

12. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

We do not believe it is possible for laboratory faculty members to be engaged in research if they are classroom teachers.

13. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

In our criteria for hiring we have been far more concerned with people's innovations and their willingness to try new ways of serving kids in a humanistic fashion than their ability to conduct research. If they can ask the kinds of questions that need to be researched, fine; but they are really not supposed to conduct the research themselves.

14. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

If any laboratory program is innovative or experimental, either in connection with its programs for youngsters or its teacher education program, it can be of significance in serving as a forerunner for change in education. I think it's important to add one issue. It's not that the programs in campus schools will have such an impact, but experimental, innovative programs may lead to research which can be a pilot and which may be of assistance to public education.

15. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

I think one type of educational research which we should be doing is a longitudinal study, looking at all of the premises that are held about what a school program should be like. We should be doing types of research to eliminate or look at the education of children in different ways than we have in the past.

16. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

I feel that the research has been financed in this operation by a "shoestring budget." There were a few students on work study programs and a few students from education who could help. The only finances for this research was the salary of one researcher.

17. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

There are many kinds of research which the education division of our university would like to conduct in this particular laboratory school. Most of them have not even been communicated to us. In my own experience with two campus schools, I feel that there has never been a financial commitment to really research what the campus school is asked to do.

APPENDIX II

FORMS USED IN CONDUCTING THE STUDY

COVER LETTER FOR INITIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Box 4537, Tech Station
Ruston, Louisiana 71270
October 6, 1972

Dear Sir:

I am making a study of the quantity and type of research being conducted in campus laboratory schools. This study is being conducted under the supervision of a committee of the College of Education of Louisiana State University as my doctoral research study.

My first task is to locate the laboratory schools controlled by NCATE institutions in which research is being conducted. Enclosed is a questionnaire designed to secure this information. Your assistance in completing this brief questionnaire will be deeply appreciated.

For the purpose of this study, a laboratory school is defined as a school under the administration and control of the college or university.

For your convenience, a self-addressed envelope is enclosed for returning the questionnaire. Please complete the questionnaire and return before October 23, if possible.

Your cooperation in this part of the study is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hearn, Director
A. E. Phillips
Laboratory School
Louisiana Tech University

REH/csf

Enclosures

INITIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH STUDY

1. Name of Institution: _____

2. Name and title of person completing this form: _____

_____

3. We do not have a college-controlled laboratory school on our campus or off our campus. _____

IF YOU HAVE CHECKED NO. 3 ABOVE, PLEASE STOP HERE.

4. The official name of our laboratory school is: _____

_____

5. Name and title of the head of our laboratory school:

_____

His (Her) mailing address: _____

_____

6. Our laboratory school includes the following grades: __

7. Total student enrollment in laboratory school: _____

8. Total number of faculty members in laboratory school:__

9. Within the past five years our laboratory school has engaged in the following number of research projects or studies:

_____ Number of studies published

_____ Number of studies unpublished

INITIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

_____ Number of studies in progress

_____ Number of studies involving specific grants or funds

10. Research studies involving our laboratory school were conducted or are being conducted by:

(Please check one or more, as appropriate.)

_____ our graduate students

_____ College of Education faculty members

_____ our laboratory school faculty members

_____ other faculty members of the university

_____ our research bureau or division

_____ other (Please explain briefly) _____

_____

_____

Robert E. Hearn
Box 4537, Tech Station
Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, Louisiana 71270

THANK YOU

COVER LETTER FOR INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER

P. O. Box 4537
Tech Station
Ruston, Louisiana 71270

Thank you for your response to my recent questionnaire.

As you may remember, I am conducting, under the supervision of a committee of the College of Education, Louisiana State University, a study concerning the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools.

Many leaders in teacher education, and especially individuals directly involved with laboratory schools, have recognized a need for this study. I feel your participation could add valuable information to a study designed to benefit both teacher education and laboratory schools.

If you are willing to cooperate in this study, please complete the enclosed form and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Schedule sheets will be forwarded for you to supply the necessary information.

I will be very happy to send you a copy of the summary of findings.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hearn, Director
A. E. Phillips Laboratory School
Louisiana Tech University

REH/csf

Enclosures

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN A STUDY

OF THE RESEARCH FUNCTION OF COLLEGE-

CONTROLLED LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Institution: _____

Invitation addressed to: _____
(Due to referral)

_____

This form was completed by (Name): _____

Position: _____ Address: _____

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR CHOICE OF RESPONSE BELOW WITH A CHECK:

_____I _____ We have considered your invitation and

_____would _____would not be willing to participate further as one of the twenty-three NCATE-approved institutions having one of the college-controlled* laboratory schools reporting research activity above the average of the seventy-two responding.

*The budget and policies are subject to control or review by the Dean of the College and/or the President of the University.

Robert E. Hearn
Box 4537, Tech Station
Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, Louisiana 71270

COVER LETTER FOR INSTITUTIONS

AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER

P. O. Box 4537
Tech Station
Ruston, Louisiana 71270

Thank you for agreeing to participate further in this doctoral study of the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools.

From among 284 institutions surveyed, your school was found to be among the twenty-three reporting research activity above the average among the seventy-two college-controlled laboratory schools reporting research activity within the past five years.

The enclosed forms will help us determine more clearly the nature of the research activity of interest to laboratory school personnel and to identify the types of research problems studied. I am enclosing a five-page schedule for reporting the titles and authors of the studies that have been conducted and other suggestions or comments you might like to make.

In addition to the schedules for reporting research, enclosed is a Taped Response Schedule which requests data not supplied on the other schedules. It is my hope that the tape will save you time in writing responses to the questions. However, feel free to react to each question in writing if you choose.

Enclosed for your convenience is a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your use in returning the schedules and taped response.

Upon receipt of the enclosed schedules from the participating institutions, the data gathering portion

COVER LETTER FOR INSTITUTIONS

AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER (continued)

of the study will be complete. I am most grateful to you for your willing and valuable contributions.

As indicated earlier, you may expect to receive a copy of the summary of findings.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hearn, Director
A. E. Phillips Laboratory School
Louisiana Tech University

REH/csf

Enclosures

Schedule A

FOR REPORTING LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH

Studies which have been published since September, 1967 (disseminated through books, bulletins, periodicals, or duplicated materials):

Title	Author or Authors

(Please include copies of research if you have not already done so.)

Schedule B

FOR REPORTING LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH

Studies which have not been published since September, 1967. (Studies which have not been disseminated. This includes Master's theses and doctoral studies, as well as any other materials which have been typed but not duplicated or disseminated.)

Title	Author or Authors

(Please use additional pages if necessary.)

Schedule C

FOR REPORTING LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH

Studies now in progress (and not yet prepared for reporting.)

Title	Author or Authors

Schedule D

FOR REPORTING LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH

Studies by your institution which seem to be of special interest to Laboratory School personnel:

Title	Author or Authors

Schedule E

FOR REPORTING LABORATORY SCHOOL RESEARCH

Comments, suggestions, or further information:

TAPED RESPONSE SCHEDULE

1. Please begin your tape by giving your name, position laboratory school, and student population of the laboratory school.

2. Please describe the community briefly and the manner in which your students are selected for admission to the laboratory school.

3. How long has research been a function of this laboratory school?

4. Do you have an official policy statement concerning research in this laboratory school? (Please state briefly on tape and return a printed copy if available.)

5. Please rank the functions of your laboratory school in order of importance.

6. Do you feel that this laboratory school has conducted research in keeping with the rank you have indicated in question No. 5 above?

7. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have facilitated productive research in this laboratory school?

8. What factors, conditions, or other considerations seem to have hindered productive research in this laboratory school?

9. How are the results of the research in this laboratory school disseminated?

10. Given the opportunity to do exactly as you would like, what changes would you make regarding the factors, conditions, or arrangements now affecting research in this laboratory school?

11. Who initiates the research conducted in this laboratory school?

TAPED RESPONSE SCHEDULE (continued)

12. Are laboratory faculty members engaged in research given release time or other compensation for such research activity?

13. Do you think it practicable for a laboratory school faculty member to be a full-time teacher and do research?

14. In your criteria for employing faculty members in the laboratory school, how important is their capability in conducting research?

15. Do you consider any aspects of the research function of laboratory schools as unique?

16. What particular types of educational research do you think are most appropriate in a laboratory school program?

17. Describe the manner by which laboratory school-connected research is financed in this school.

18. Please make any additional comments related to the research function of college-controlled laboratory schools which are not covered in the questions above.

VITA

Robert Ethiel Hearn was born February 16, 1935 at Shreveport, Louisiana. He attended public schools in Caddo Parish and was graduated from Fair Park High School in 1953. During 1953-54 he attended Louisiana Tech University in Ruston.

From 1955 until 1957, he served in the United States Air Force. Upon completion of his tour of duty with the Air Force, Mr. Hearn enrolled in Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana, and received his Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education in 1960. While pursuing this degree, Mr. Hearn was a full-time employee of the United States Post Office, serving as a letter carrier and special delivery messenger.

Mr. Hearn began his teaching career in Caddo Parish at the junior high level, teaching language arts and social studies. In 1965, he was employed as a Staff Associate with Science Research Associates, an educational subsidiary of International Business Machines. While working for Science Research Associates, he completed the requirements for his Master of Arts degree which was granted in 1966 from Northwestern State University.

Mr. Hearn returned to the teaching profession in 1968 as a junior high school science teacher and coach. During this time, he pursued graduate courses leading to certification as a school counselor. In 1969 he served as a counselor at Fair Park High School.

Mr. Hearn enrolled at Louisiana State University to pursue work toward the degree of Doctor of Education in the summer of 1969.

In September of 1970, Mr. Hearn was employed by Louisiana Tech University as director of the A. E. Phillips Laboratory School and is presently serving in this capacity.

In May, 1959, Mr. Hearn married Margie Simmons. They have one daughter, Sharon Marie, and one son, Robert, Jr.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Robert E. Hearn

Major Field: Education

Title of Thesis: RESEARCH AS A FUNCTION OF SELECTED COLLEGE-CONTROLLED LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Approved:

Ollie B. Hughes
Major Professor and Chairman

Max Goodrich
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Alvin L. DeVrond

David Jones

W. R. Eg

B. C. Gibson

Jesse J. Parker

Date of Examination:

June 14, 1973